

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES

VOL. XLI

No. 7

JULY 1956

THE CHURCH ON A MISSIONARY FOOTING

MONSIGNOR LÉON-JOSEPH SUENENS, Auxiliary Bishop of Malines, has become known since the war as one of the foremost exponents of the principles of the Lay Apostolate. Born in Brussels in 1904, and acquiring in due course doctorates in Philosophy and Theology and a licentiate in Canon Law at the Gregorian University in Rome, he spent ten years as Professor of Philosophy at the Malines Seminary. After the war he was made Auxiliary Bishop of his diocese. With the introduction of the Legion of Mary to Belgium Cardinal van Roey entrusted his Auxiliary Bishop with its direction. It is typical of His Lordship, a scholar and administrator, that his first concern was to examine the origins and spiritual foundations of the organization, in order to satisfy himself that it would be for the good of the Church in Belgium to encourage it. The fruits of his enquiries in Dublin and his study of the Handbook of the Legion of Mary are contained in his book, *The Theology of the Apostolate*, published in an English translation by the Mercier Press in 1953. Bishop Suenens has also become known to many English readers as the author of *Edel Quinn*, the biography of the Legion's first envoy to East Africa, whose holy life and heroic exploits have done so much to impress bishops and priests with the value of this organization.

No one would therefore question the authority of Monsignor Suenens, when he presents us with a further work, published in French under the title of *L'Eglise en Etat de Mission*, and shortly to be provided in an English translation as *The Gospel to Every Creature*. The original title explains better the purpose of the book. For this work sets out to explain the missionary character of the Church, and to show how it can be organized to include not only priests and religious, but every member of the Church. It offers a blueprint for organizing the Church on a missionary footing, an idea given in the Bishop's own title.

The English title expresses rather the ultimate aim and consequence of his plan, and makes it sound like just another book on the Apostolate. It is in fact a challenging work which, one hopes, will be studied by every priest and religious superior. No one interested in the spread of the Kingdom of Christ should fail to do so. This analysis of the book is offered, not with any intention of providing a substitute, but in the hope that the ideas expressed may be recognized as extremely valuable for our times and the book widely read and studied.

The book develops the idea expressed by Cardinal Feltin when he said: "It is the whole Church that must be put on a missionary footing." The problem is to deal effectively with the dechristianized masses. We live in the midst of them. Very often they are good people who in practical charity put us to shame. But although our society retains certain relics of Christian culture and morality, the principles of Christianity have no practical importance in the personal lives of the majority of our fellow-countrymen nor in the activities of the politicians who govern us.

As followers of Christ we have obligations towards our fellowmen. The last words of our Lord before he left this world were a command to preach the Gospel to every creature. The Church has been trying to do that ever since. She prays daily through all her children, "Thy Kingdom Come". She has made this prayer for 2000 years day after day, and it is still the *raison d'être* of the Church that Christ founded, that the Mystical Body of Christ should be co-terminous with the human race. But how far we are from realizing that end! Out of a world population of nearly 2,500,000,000 there are something in the region of 472,000,000 Catholics. And it would be naïve to suggest that every one of that number is a model Catholic. The obstacles to the conversion of the world are many. Some we recognize within ourselves, but many are from outside. There have been obstacles from the beginning. The Roman Empire was one. Islam was another. The former defeated itself, the latter was confined. Protestantism was a threat of a different kind, but at least it was trying to be Christian. The threat we face today is more powerful than any that has had to be faced in the past, and at present it shows no signs of being overcome.

Atheistic Communism pursues its relentless way, and those who do not treat it as the greatest menace ever to oppose Christianity are deluding themselves. Based on a materialist philosophy, it denies everything that Christians consider to be of value. It appeals to intellectual and illiterate alike, for having once accepted its philosophical premises, its conclusions follow logically; and from a political and economic angle it appears to offer remedies for the under-privileged masses. It has the power to inspire just that apostolic and self-sacrificing enthusiasm which led the early Christians to martyrdom. Today, unfortunately, few find that inspiration in Christianity. But Christianity still has the power to inspire, and if the Church is to overcome the threat of Communism, Christians must re-learn the lessons of the past, and recapture the zeal of the martyrs. We can learn from Communism the dynamic spirit which seeks to spread its doctrines. This plus grace is all we require to reconquer the world for Christ. In the face of the threat there are two attitudes current today. One is ostrichism which leads one to bury one's head in the sand and forget. The other is to try and offer a materialistic solution to the spiritual ills of the world by means of a rival economic system. Both attitudes are defeatist and doomed to failure. The Christian must offer the Gospel, believing it to be the only answer to every human problem. It has been said many times that Christianity has never been tried. How true this is!

Speaking of the method of evangelization, Bishop Suenens refers to a theory which has become quite common and used as the basis of some apostolic experiments in recent years. It is said that the dechristianized masses are not convertible within two or three generations. They have become too far separated from the Christian tradition. Therefore the method must be to follow two successive phases, liberation and evangelization. A social revolution must be brought about before ordinary people are likely to be amenable to the Gospel. This is quite contrary to the meaning of Christianity. It is intended to penetrate every part of human life, whatever its material conditions may be. It must take into account the fact that we are a fallen race, and that an earthly paradise is not a practical possibility. Beatitude is not for this world. It is true that much human behaviour,

man's dealing with his fellows, is inhuman in character, and this needs to be corrected. But the humanizing of man is not something that can be achieved alone. It must be part of the programme of christianization. Humanization is bound up with redemption. It is, in its real sense, a fruit of redemption. There is a double rhythm in Christianity. Sanctification is instantaneous, brought about by the reception of grace through the Sacraments. But its effect, Christian humanization, is prolonged. It involves a long struggle against human weaknesses. The leaven of the Gospel can quickly be implanted in the Christian mass, but it takes time to leaven the whole.

This must be remembered in working for social reform. Every political or economic act has some bearing on religion. Social reform can either favour or impede religion. Therefore Christians must take their part in civic life in order to influence reform. Evangelization and humanization are concomitant.

The words of the present Pope remind us of the truth of this thesis. Speaking to Italian Catholic Action at Pentecost 1951, he said: "The development of the religious life supposes a certain quantity of healthy social and economic conditions. But that does not permit one to conclude that the Church must put aside her religious mission and procure before everything the alleviation of social misery. Even if the Church always strives to defend and promote justice, she has also, from the time of the apostles, accomplished her mission of sanctification of souls and interior conversion, even in the face of the gravest social abuses, seeking in all things to fight against these evils, persuaded that religious forces and Christian principles are the best means of obtaining their cure." Christianity is the way to social order, its denial, in general sin, is anti-social. As Bishop Suenens remarks: "No one is more human than Christ and nothing is more damaging to man than to disown him."

There are two ways of following the apostolate, one direct and the other indirect. Both are inspired by the same end, the conversion of souls. But the first works by the direct appeal to religious truth, whereas the second tries to win souls to religious truth by offering a material service, such as medical care, from the motive of charity. Both are lawful, both can achieve much if practised by men of God. But there is no substitute for the

direct method. It was followed by our Lord and the Apostles, and has the warrant of Christ's words: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his justice, and all these things shall be added unto you." There is a great temptation to concentrate on the indirect apostolate. More visible fruit is obtained by it, more gratitude is the reward. Or excuses are made, that prayer is more important, duties of one's state of life prevent it; others claim to concentrate on the intellectual side of it, thinking and writing for the guidance of others. These things must be done. There must be a rational and spiritual foundation for the apostolate. But the primary duty of one's state of life as a Christian is to practise the apostolate. However good the foundation may be, the consequence of the neglect of the apostolate itself is the dechristianization of the masses.

People would find more encouragement to practise the apostolate if they were convinced of the unity of the priestly and the lay apostolate. They both follow from the same thing, the sharing in the priesthood of Christ. By incorporation into the Mystical Body of Christ all participate in the office and work of Christ. His office was that of High Priest. His work was that of Redemption. We have come to think that the priesthood is the sole prerogative of the ordained ministers of the altar, a class apart who alone distribute the fruits of the Priesthood of Christ. It is true that in an important sense the priesthood is limited in this way. But enough has been written of the priesthood of the laity to show that it is something real. The priesthood of the laity derives from the two sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation, the priesthood of the priest derives in addition from the further sacrament of Holy Order. It should be observed that these three sacraments are the only ones that give spiritual power, a participation in the priestly redemptive power of the High Priest who is their source.

The ministerial priesthood and the priesthood of the laity therefore, having the same root, must be distinguished only for the purpose of seeing their unity. They must also yield the same fruit; evangelization, redemption. As Cardinal Suhard has said: "The complete worker of evangelization is not the simple baptized Christian, nor the priest alone, but the Christian community. The basic cell, the unit of measure in the apostolate, is,

as everywhere, like a sort of organic composition, the inseparable duality: priesthood-laity." Each, priest and layman, works with the other, each is dependent on the other; the priest is in the lead.

But the Bishop is not oblivious of the fact that these ideas are strange to our ears. We must become familiar with them. "The priesthood," he says, "is too much isolated from the laity. How easily one thinks that the role of the layman begins only in case of a dearth of clergy and by way of a substitute. It has been said to the laity that they have to be apostles in virtue of their baptism. It has not perhaps been said enough to priests that it follows from that, that their duty is to furnish or to open up to the laity a field of apostolic activity and to train them in it. The clergy will only convert the world if they guard themselves from all isolationism and collaborate with the laity whom they must make aware of their responsibilities." This then is the triple task of the priest, to find, train and use his collaborators. Only when he has done this will the Church be on a missionary footing.

The first half of this book covers ground which has already been well ploughed, but which nevertheless benefits greatly from this further cultivation. It is in the second half that Bishop Suenens makes his most original contribution to the literature of the lay apostolate. It is a contribution which many have contemplated but none has had the courage to offer. If it is accepted, as one hopes it will be, it will bring about a revolution in Christian society.

Developing his vision of the whole Church engaged in the direct apostolate, he gives a special place to those who can be given the common name of the auxiliaries of the clergy. Behind the bishops and priests there is a special place for those who are dedicated to the service of Christ in the religious life. He writes: "If the whole Church is under the necessity of putting itself on a missionary footing, this necessity is imposed by a special title on those men and women who can be included under the generic name of the auxiliaries of the clergy; the brothers or non-priest religious, the female religious in the canonical sense of the word, the members of secular institutes, and more widely still, those souls consecrated to God and working for him in the

world. Their collaboration in the apostolate of the Church poses a vast problem. Too often the question of co-operation in the apostolate is reduced to the relations between priest and laity, and a role and organic place is not assigned to these select elements who are also indispensable." If all these consecrated souls are not included in the apostolic work of the Church, there is certainly a gap in our pastoral organization. Devoted as their work is, it is too often in self-contained compartments, which have little influence on the Church's work at large.

Therefore religious must look outwards to the world to see what part they can play in helping to organize the laity as helpers of the priest. This is particularly necessary for religious women who to a great extent deliberately limit their attention to their own affairs within their convent walls. But this attitude is not adequate to the needs of our times. Women now occupy a place of great importance in society. They are found in high places in politics, science, administration, commerce. Some of the ability and talent used in these spheres of activity should be used in the apostolate. There are, of course, apostolic societies for the laity, both men and women, but they can only cater for a small part of the mass of Catholics. The lay apostolate however, as we have seen, is an obligation on all who are baptized and confirmed. Therefore some other way must be found of training the laity. It is this function that religious can perform, if they are trained to do so. Pope Pius XI has said that training of the laity in apostolic action is an integral part of the religious vocation. The objection is commonly made that such work is incompatible with the religious life. It is said that the timetable which has to be observed in conventual life makes it impossible. Bishop Suenens replies that timetables must be altered to meet new demands. If it has not been altered for fifty years, it is probable that it no longer meets the needs of today. The same applies to customs and constitutions. Exercises of piety must not be allowed to impede the all-important work of the apostolate, nor must the very structure of an Order be allowed to impede the primary purpose of its existence. The author has some bold words on this subject: "Each congregation, it will be said, was founded with a precise end in view; the apostolic mission does not enter into the framework of their rules. Under this form the

objection does not hold either. Beneath every positive rule there is the great law of the Gospel and the universal commandment of our Lord. To make overtures to the world is an obligation of divine right, inherent in our baptism, and the injunction of Christ: *Go, carry the Gospel to every creature*, is a permanent and imperious order which touches us all, whatever may be the manner of its realization. Each congregation particularizes not the end, which is common, but the means of attaining it; each rule is of value only in the measure by which it allows its subjects to respond better to the call of the Gospel. Religious vows are only the consummation of the baptismal profession; they increase to the maximum the value of baptism, common to all. The duty of the baptismal state is the same for religious as for the laity, and it supersedes the duty of state in the professional sense. No one has the right to limit one's duty of state to the good management of a home or a school, and to confine oneself to the success of one's institution."

Here is a clear call to the superiors of religious institutes to examine their rules and constitutions in the light of the apostolate to every creature, and make any necessary alterations. This will have the effect not only of making the institute a more powerful instrument for the conversion of souls and of promoting mutual understanding and sympathy between religious and seculars, but also of encouraging vocations to the religious life. That adaptation is required has not escaped the notice of the present Pope Pius XII. Speaking at the Congress of Religious in Rome, he said: "At most times legislators of religious institutes conceived their new foundation as means of fulfilling functions or of responding to necessities which were appearing in the Church and would not suffer delay. If then you wish to follow the example of your founders, conform your attitude to theirs. Study the opinions, the judgements and the customs of the contemporaries among whom you live and, if you discover elements which are just and good, adopt them; if you do not, you will not be able to enlighten, help, encourage, guide your neighbour."

If these words of the Pope were to be followed, we should find that our Catholic schools, hospitals, homes, etc., were training grounds for an apostolic laity. Whatever the condition or

state of life of the patient or pupil, they would be receiving instruction and guidance in the principles of the apostolate. What a new meaning this gives to our fight for Catholic schools! This is a training that cannot be given elsewhere.

Bishop Suenens next considers how this training is to be conducted. He concludes that if it is to be effective, the training must be direct. All religious training is in a sense a training in the apostolate, since all true spiritual principles can be related to the conversion of souls. But that alone is not enough. The apostolate is a highly specialized work. It is the work of the whole Church, priest, auxiliary and laity. If priest and auxiliary are to train the laity, they must themselves be experts, and they will not become experts through the indirect training of seminary or novitiate. The training must comprise piety, study and action. The apostolate must be in view in each, and piety and study must be designed to lead on to action. The emphasis in the training must be on action as the complement of piety and study, and to be of any value the action must include actual contact with souls.

The author then provides a plan of training. This chapter will repay close study, and in the process give more cause for heart-searching than any other part of the book. It is here, on the question of active training in the apostolate, that religious authorities ought, in the Bishop's view, to give serious thought to how the courses in seminary and novitiate can be modified. It is true that some seminaries already provide opportunities for the students to gain practical experience with people, but it is perhaps exceptional, and in any case it is voluntary and a free-time addition to the regular course. This alone makes it inadequate, for to have such an inessential part in the curriculum inevitably means that it will not be considered to be of the greatest importance. The curriculum needs modification so that active contact with souls has an important part, and is in a true sense the culmination of the theoretical training in theology and ascetics.

"At the Congress of the Lay Apostolate in Rome, Pius XII said: 'As far as the Church is concerned, she has a threefold mission to fulfil for the benefit of all men: to raise up fervent believers to the level of the needs of the present day; to usher

those who hesitate on the threshold into the warm and wholesome friendship within; and to bring back to the fold those who have strayed from religion. She cannot abandon these people to their unhappy fate.' To raise up, to usher in, to bring back: there is the work that the Pope points out to every baptized person, on the sole title of his baptism. If they had remained in the world, the young people in our centres of formation would have had to accomplish this task which a good number of their companions of the same age accomplish, possessing neither their formation nor their culture. This programme of action, outlined by Pope Pius XII, can be infinitely varied and take many forms, contacts with the old or the sick by visiting them in their homes or in hostels and hospitals; contacts preparatory to missions, retreats, liturgical solemnities; contacts with parents whose children go or do not go to catechism classes or Catholic schools; contacts to prepare an adult for baptism or confirmation, contacts on the occasion of a death or a vigil of prayer; contacts to recruit and train members for various works such as Catholic Action movements; contacts to awaken a sense of responsibility and stimulate the apostolate among those who belong to no organization; contacts for the diffusion of the good press; contacts to invite people to family or public prayers; and so many others. This is not to mention the immense field of action which could be opened up progressively among non-practising Christians and unbelievers themselves, thanks to a great variety of undertakings of a social order which could be the means of entry and the way of enlarging the sphere of influence." In these words Bishop Suenens shows how vast is the field of activity in which seminarists and novices could be trained in the active apostolate. And lest it should be thought that this idea is completely revolutionary, he points out that it was included in the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus by St Ignatius for the training of his novices. A great deal of time need not be given to it. A little is enough to reveal the secret of the apostolate. As he says: "the soul of the apostolate is personal contact".

1 Bishop Suenens concludes by showing that this view of the apostolate is the only complete fulfilment of our Lord's commandment: "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel

to every creature." It is for all to all. The commandment must be obeyed. The world will judge us according to how we obey. It will respond if we obey well. "The response will depend on the intelligence and the courage with which priests, religious and faithful succeed, with the grace of God, in putting the Church of the twentieth century on a missionary footing."

It cannot be denied that this is the age of the lay apostolate. It is the special characteristic of the Church today that the laity have been called to the apostolate in unmistakable terms by a succession of popes, to co-operate with the priest in the salvation of souls. So far, for every priest or lay person convinced there are twenty who hold back. It is not too much to suggest that this book is one of the most important to be published on the subject. It is the fruit of much original thought and presents a picture of the Church organized on a missionary footing which, if realized, could provide, by a positive Christian victory, the means of successfully fighting the terrible threat of atheistic Marxism under which we live today.

W. J. STIBBS

*Spiritual Director of the English
Senatus of the Legion of Mary*

THE ORIGIN OF MAN

SCIENTIFIC CONSIDERATIONS

THAT the apes formed a kind of link between man and the rest of the animal creation was a supposition which provided food for speculation long before the age of Darwin. We find it mentioned in the writings of the sixteenth-century French political thinker Jean Bodin.¹ Yet when a century later the English naturalist, John Ray, undertook his systematic classification of mammals and reptiles, unlike his successor Linnaeus,

¹ "Entre les homes et les autres bestes sont les singes et les cercophites" (*Démonomanie des sorciers*, Paris, 1598, p. 63).

he excluded man from his scheme though he did note some resemblance between human and simian dentition.

If there was any idea of evolution in Ray's mind the time had not yet arrived to give expression to it. In the eighteenth century Linnaeus, the most celebrated of animal classifiers, though an opponent of evolution, in the tenth edition of his *Systema Naturae*, boldly included man within the animal kingdom. Linnaeus's contemporary Buffon in ironical language confesses his belief in evolution. With an affectation which is but too obvious he scorns the suggestion that the horse and the ass are related; since did one admit it one would find it difficult to deny kinship between man and ape. Voltaire in the introduction to the *Essai sur les Moeurs* hints at the possibility that there may once have been races of men or of animals near to men which have now perished. Lord Monboddo was bolder, and expressed the opinion that man had once been a quadruped,¹ but as he also believed in mermaids the world felt that it could smile at him. Lamarck developed the idea of evolution. If, he suggested, a race of animals with four hands were for some reason compelled to use its hind limbs only for walking it would eventually become two-handed. The erect posture might (though it is not quite clear how) confer on those who possessed it dominance over other animals.

Lamarck's advocacy of evolution was premature. Under the influence of Cuvier a reaction set in. In 1844 appeared the popular work of Robert Chambers, *Vestiges of Creation*, embodying the last stages of pre-Darwinian thought. The author went so far as to hint that mammals might have proceeded from reptiles. On the subject of man's origin he is non-committal, though he says that there is no scientific explanation of the fact that the *Bimana*, or two-handed animals, are represented only by a single species. Darwin was convinced that man had sprung from an ape-like ancestry some years before he developed this theme in print. But his lieutenants, Thomas Henry Huxley and Ernst Haeckel, preceded him in this matter, and during the decade 1860-70 the theory of evolution achieved so spectacular a triumph that when at the close of it Darwin published his *Descent of Man* he was addressing a scientific world which, if

¹ *Ancient Metaphysics*, Edinburgh, 1795, iv, 26.

not wholly converted, was at least nearly so. With the religious world it was far otherwise and stormy days were still to come.

To include man within the animal kingdom at all has seemed to some religious minds an impiety. When Chateaubriand published his *Génie du Christianisme* in 1802 he uttered a moving, though ineffective, protest against it, urging that man, instead of being ranged with the apes, the bats and the sloths as was done by Linnaeus, should be left at the head of creation where Moses, Aristotle, Buffon and nature herself had placed him. Judged by his mental powers man indeed forms a kingdom of his own. Had animal life exhibited no higher manifestations than the gorilla and the chimpanzee the earth would never have been cultivated and the oceans would never have been crossed.

Yet it remains true that man is an animal and as such there is justification in assigning to him a place in the animal creation. When viewed in relation to other animals it is obvious that he does not resemble all in an equal degree.

That man is a mammal is not disputed. That he belongs to the order of mammals to which Linnaeus gave the name *primates* or "first ones" because they included man is generally, though not quite universally, accepted. Among those who maintain that man is a primate there has been, however, a wide difference of opinion with regard to his place in that order, and no less a further difference with regard to the animals which should be included in it. Linnaeus included the bats among the "primates", but modern classifiers make of them an order, of their own, the *chiroptera*. The primate order is generally held to include, in addition to man, the anthropoid apes, the Old World and New World monkeys, the tarsiers and the lemurs. Some zoologists withdraw the lemurs from the primates and include them in a separate order along with the *tupaïidae* or tree-shrews. Two or three sub-orders of primates are usually recognized; one, including man, the anthropoid apes and the smaller monkeys, a second, the lemurs, while a third, including the tarsiers, is now generally admitted.

The task of physical anthropology has been to study the comparative anatomy of the primates and to frame hypotheses to account for the resemblances and also the divergencies

between different members of the order. It is obvious even to the untrained eye that, superficially at least, man resembles the anthropoid apes more closely than he does other members of the primate order, while, among the anthropoids, he resembles the *pongidae*, which include the gorilla, the chimpanzee, and the orang-utan more closely than he does the *hylobatidae* or gibbons who seem to form a kind of bridge between the man-like apes and the smaller monkeys. Of the three larger anthropoids the preponderance of opinion among comparative anatomists seems to favour the view that man is more closely related in origin to the African anthropoids than to the Asiatic orang-utan.

Many anthropologists consider it safe to assume that man comes from a stock from which the lemurs, the platyrrhine or flat-nosed American monkeys, the catarrhine or strait-nosed monkeys of the Old World and the great apes diverged at successive epochs, making of the last man's nearest kin. Some authorities, and indeed Darwin himself, have, however, allowed themselves to envisage an alternative possibility according to which the human and anthropoid stems may have separated as far back as the time when that leading up to the Old World monkeys separated from both of them.

It has often been said that science has its orthodoxies and its heresies no less than religion, and in the matter of human evolution the "orthodox" doctrine may be said to be that which derives man from the stem to which the catarrhine apes and monkeys belong. But there are various "heresies" which give to man a longer independent ancestry. Only a few years after the appearance of Darwin's *Descent of Man*, at a time when criticism of the accepted scientific doctrine seemed almost to be blasphemy, the great zoologist St George Mivart, in the article on the apes which he contributed to the ninth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, argued that the problem of the relation of the various families of primates to each other was a more complicated one than was so lightly supposed. Mivart proceeded to advance the revolutionary theory that the Old World and New World apes had arisen independently and that their origins might have been as distant from each other as were those of either from the carnivores. He counselled a "judi-

cious scepticism" as regards the lines of primate descent which he believed were inextricably intertwined and exhibited a more complex pattern than was supposed by the anatomists of the day. As an illustration of this he mentions that in a specimen of *chrysothrix*, the Brazilian squirrel monkey, which he had examined, the cranial portion of the skull is relatively larger than in man himself.

"Mivart's facts were never refuted and his arguments never answered," says Wood Jones, "and, perhaps for that very reason, they produced little or no effect upon contemporary thought."¹ Mivart himself anticipated that there would be found the remains of apes which resembled men rather than of men who resembled apes.

We have said that what may be called "orthodox" evolutionary theory is that which links man's origin with that of the Old World apes. In opposition to it three "heresies" have arisen. The first derives man from the same stock as the platyrrhine or New World monkeys; the second, a more radical one, assigns to him a lemuroid or tarsioid ancestry; the third, more radical still, withdraws him from the primate order altogether and argues for his descent from a common undifferentiated mammalian stock. The platyrrhine hypothesis has not found favour with English anatomists. It was argued for in the last century by Karl Vogt, Ameghino and Sera, but it fell into discredit in consequence of its reliance on some faulty palaeontological deductions. The second view which gives to mankind a lemuroid or tarsioid ancestry has found some able defenders. In the last century it was upheld by the American anatomist E. D. Cope. More recently it has found supporters in Hubrecht and Wood Jones. These two anatomists find in the spectral tarsier the animal most closely related to man. Professor Wood Jones, an anatomist of distinction, first put forward his theory in 1918 in a pamphlet which was productive of some sarcasm in that it was published by the S.P.C.K. The controversy which the professor kindled had, however, but little in common with those of the nineteenth century in which both sides took it for granted that belief in the Bible excluded belief in the evolution of the human body.

¹ *Hallmarks of Mankind* (1948), pp. 9, 10.

In opposition to the prevalent view that man sprang from an anthropoid stock, Wood Jones believes that the proto-human one "was represented by small animals that led active arboreal lives, and were probably mainly diurnal in habit. We may further," he continues, "assume that they possessed hind limbs somewhat longer than their fore limbs; that they were erect and bipedal in poise and progression; that their brain and brain-case were enlarged, that the jaws and teeth were relatively small, and that the orbits were only moderately enlarged and were separated by a comparatively wide interorbital space".¹

Asked whether there is any vestige of positive evidence that these hypothetical creatures ever existed Wood Jones suggests that the fossil mandible from the Oligocene of Egypt attributed to *propliopithecus* may possibly be a relic of the proto-human stock, though he admits that it is more probably a primitive gibbon.

As has been indicated, the tarsier, a small nocturnal mammal about the size of a rat found in the East Indies, is on this hypothesis the animal most closely related to man. The "tarsioid heresy" has not been able to claim any very large following, since the great majority of anatomists feel that it does not do sufficient justice to the numerous and positive resemblances between man and the great apes. Still less support has been won by the more fundamental scientific heresy which assigns to man an ancestry independent not merely of that of the apes but of all the non-human primates and, in some cases, of the other mammals as well.

More than thirty years ago, a Catholic professor at Montpellier named Vialleton denied that man was a primate and maintained that he was a *type d'organization*. More recently a German anatomist and Professor Emeritus at the University of Berlin, Dr Max Westenhöfer, in a series of works in German and Spanish has maintained that man derives from a stem which is proper to him and which attaches itself directly to that from which all the mammals come, being, indeed, but little removed from the mammalian ancestral type. The monotremes and marsupials Westenhöfer looks on as aberrant branches. The apes come from a branch which has detached itself laterally from the proto-human stem not far from its root. Westenhöfer cites the

¹ *Man's Place among the Mammals* (1929), p. 360.

opinion of Fick, put forward in 1853, that in the initial stages of their development all mammals display an organization superior to that which is achieved with completed growth.¹

Westenhöfer's works have not so far appeared in English, but one of them has been abridged and annotated by Dr F. S. Frechkop, a Catholic mammalogist, and published in Brussels.² Westenhöfer's ideas conflict so much with current views of human evolution that they will not readily make headway, and they have been criticized from an anthropological standpoint by Professor H. V. Vallois. "Contrairement à la thèse de M.W.," he writes, "la paléonthologie humaine nous apprend qu'à mesure qu'on remonte dans le passé, l'homme se rapproche des singes. . . ."³ Vallois does not, however, on this account regard Westenhöfer's speculations as useless. On the contrary, they serve to correct exaggerated deference to opposite tendencies. The discussion touching man's place in the animal kingdom is not yet at an end and it may be that if and when agreement is reached it will be on the basis of a view to which each of these theories will make a contribution, though not perhaps an equal one.

All the foregoing hypotheses fall within the framework of an evolutionary explanation, at least so far as the body of man is concerned. Fixism or the view which would make of all species the product of a special creation has now but little following, a fact which it would be erroneous to ascribe merely to anti-theological prejudice. Its real lack of credit is due rather to the fact that it leaves so much unexplained.

When in the 1860's the evolutionist controversy assumed so strident a tone there existed but little fossil evidence to which either side could appeal. Believers in evolution took their stand on the science of comparative morphology. The antiquity of man was indeed attested by countless finds of as yet unpolished stone implements, but these furnished evidence of his being contemporaneous with an extinct fauna rather than provided clues as to his own appearance. The cave-hunters of the early part of

¹ "The Problem of Man's Origin", *Eugenics Review*, April 1954, p. 43.

² *Le Problème de la Genèse de l'Homme*. (Editions Sobeli, 1953.)

³ *L'Anthropologie*, 1950, pp. 127-9.

the last century did, however, from time to time stumble on the remains of man himself, though they were not directly in search of him. The first human skeleton belonging to the later palaeolithic period called by French archaeologists the "Reindeer Age" was found in 1823 by William Buckland, Reader in Geology in the University of Oxford and later Dean of Westminster, at Paviland in South Wales. The skeleton which was painted red was probably that of a man belonging to the race called "Cro-Magnon". Three years before, Professor Schmerling, of Liège, had found in the cave of Engis in the Meuse Valley a skull which after being thought to be neolithic was assigned also to the upper palaeolithic.

These finds and others made in Western Europe during the following years, valuable as they were in furnishing proofs of man's antiquity, failed to throw direct light on the problem of evolution; for they were relics of a type indistinguishable from modern man.

It was in 1848 that fossil remains of a type of man differing from that which inhabits the world today were found, in the shape of the Gibraltar skull brought to light during an excavation at Forbes's Quarry on the North face of the Rock. Its low cranial vault and heavy brow-ridges put it in a different category from modern man. Despite its high interest the Gibraltar skull was quickly forgotten till it was brought to the attention of the scientific world by the geologist Dr Busk in 1864. At this time it no longer stood alone. For a few years earlier remains of a man of similar type had been found in the Neanderthal near Düsseldorf in Western Germany. Since at the time that this discovery was made the Gibraltar skull had been temporarily forgotten by the scientific world, the Neanderthal one appeared as that of an isolated specimen, and scientific opinion was divided as to whether it was in the presence of a primitive race which had preserved simian features discarded by modern ones or whether the remains were to be considered pathological. The first view came to prevail as it received confirmation from a series of further discoveries of this type beginning with that of the jaw of La Naulette found near Dinant in Belgium in 1866. Twenty years later were found in the grotto of Spy near Namur tolerably well preserved remains of two skeletons of the

same type. The stratigraphical conditions were satisfactory, the associated fauna being that of the middle pleistocene and including such species as the mammoth and the woolly rhinoceros. The flint implements found belonged to the industry to which the French archaeologists gave the name "Mousterian".¹ After the discovery of the Spy skeletons it was no longer possible to regard the original Neanderthal remains as pathological, and it became apparent that Neanderthal-Spy man was an extinct type belonging to the middle Pleistocene epoch, which contemporary archaeologists regard as extending from the third or Riss-Wurmian interglacial phase into the last or Wurmian glaciation.²

Further knowledge of this race has come from discoveries at Krapina (Croatia), the Dordogne district in France, Palestine, Central Italy and most recently Cyrenaica. Those made in the Dordogne during 1908-11 showed that Neanderthal man ceremonially interred his dead.

Professor H. V. Vallois thus epitomizes his characteristics.³ He was short, but of robust build. His head was large; the average cranial capacity reached 1450 c.c. The cranial vault was depressed, the forehead retreating. The orbits were very large and were surmounted by a heavy supra-orbital ridge. The brain conserved some primitive features both in its general convolutionary pattern and the relatively small size of the frontal lobes. The massive lower jaw was lacking in a chin or possessed only a rudimentary one. The premolar teeth preserved some simian traits.

In the opinion of Boule and Vallois, though his mode of progression was bipedal, the spine of Neanderthal man occupied a position less vertical than in modern races. The large number of individuals belonging to this type, of which remains have come to light, have made of Neanderthal man the best known of early races, and his name has been for many years familiar to the man in the street,⁴ while now it is probably not unfamiliar

¹ From the cave of Le Moustier in the Dordogne.

² The Pleistocene glaciation is usually held to embrace four phases, named Gunz, Mindel, Riss and Würm from sites in the Alps.

³ *Les Hommes Fossiles*, 4th edition, 1952, Chap. VII.

⁴ Whether there is a slight Neanderthal strain in the population of modern Europe cannot be determined with certainty. The classical Neanderthal types seems to have disappeared at the close of the Mousterian Age.

to pupils in elementary schools. The size of his brain disqualified Neanderthal man from being the ideal "missing link" between man and ape which popular opinion was seeking, but he was widely regarded as a type ancestral to modern man, a view which is now giving place to one less simple. Since Neanderthal man was first shown to be a distinct type, nearly seventy years ago, other continents than Europe have made their contribution to the material available for the study of primitive man and anthropologists are confronted with a problem of increasing complexity. Taken in historical sequence, the next human or subhuman fossil type to become known was the *pithecanthropus* or ape-man of Java. Today evolution in some form or another is so widely taken for granted that the excitement aroused at the time that the original specimen of *pithecanthropus* was found may easily be forgotten.

In 1889 Dr Eugen Dubois, a Dutch army surgeon, obtained permission from the Government of the Netherlands Indies to excavate some Javanese ossiferous deposits of volcanic origin. Amid the extensive mammalian remains which rewarded his search, Dubois during the early nineties came across the remains of a large and hitherto unknown primate, represented by a skullcap, a femur and two teeth. The discovery, the most important in the study of the fossil primates which had so far been made, attracted wide attention. For it clearly (however interpreted) supplied evidence of the former existence of a creature intermediate in brain size between known man and ape. The skullcap, more elevated than that of an anthropoid and more depressed than that of a man, betokened a cranial capacity of 850-900 c.c., a figure midway between that common in primitive human races and the highest limit met with in the gorilla, the largest of the manlike apes. The original femur found some fifteen yards from the skullcap betokened an erect attitude on the part of its possessor and a height of from 1m.60 to 1m.70. The femur and cranium were found at sufficient distance from each other to render doubtful their attribution to the same individual, but their attribution to the same species remains probable.

No hypothesis has been left unframed to account for this strange being. It has been suggested that it was a real ape-man in an evolutionary stage midway between man and ape, corres-

pondering to Haeckel's *homo alalus* or his *homo stupidus*. At the other extreme it has been suggested that *pithecanthropus* was a large gibbon, an idea toyed with by Dubois himself in his later years. Even the strange suggestion that the Java ape-man was a hybrid, sprung from one human and one simian parent, has been made. The view was also put forward that he was a microcephalic idiot, but such would have stood but scant chance of surviving to maturity in the conditions under which we must suppose *pithecanthropus* to have lived. For if he had escaped assassination and possibly cannibalism on the part of his fellows he would in all probability have met his end in the jaws of a tiger or a crocodile. These speculations, freely as they might be indulged in forty or fifty years ago, have now been rendered largely if not wholly superfluous by the accumulation of additional *pithecanthropus* material.

During 1936-39 Dr von Königswald found at Sangiran, some 60 km. from Trinil, remains of three other individuals (referred to as *Pithecanthropus* II, III, IV). He also found the cranium of an infant of about two years (*Homo modjokertensis*) and part of a lower jaw (1941) with very large teeth which he ascribes to a special type of *Pithecanthropus*, *Meganthropus palaeojavanicus*. The new discoveries tend to fortify the view that *pithecanthropus* was a man or at least a hominid, a position further strengthened by knowledge of the closely related Peking man. But fifty years ago *pithecanthropus* stood isolated, the sole relic of pre-Neanderthal man. This isolation was broken down by the discovery in 1907, in a sandpit at Mauer, near Heidelberg, at a depth of 78 feet below the surface, of a massive human or hominid jaw with large ascending ramus and shallow sigmoid notch and absence of a chin. The dentition is surprisingly human. In its general conformation the jaw strongly recalls the Neanderthal ones, but the associated fauna, including *elephas antiquus* and *Rhinoceros etruscus*, suggests an older horizon. Duckworth has suggested that the jaw may be that of a western *pithecanthropus*, and so may be evidence of a wide distribution of an early ancestral type, but Keith has argued that the jaw is too massive to be articulated to a cranium of only 900 c.c.

Bonarelli has sought to promote the Heidelberg man to generic rank, naming him *palaeoanthropus*, but this is too bold a

step to be prudently taken on the basis of a single jaw. Yet Heidelberg man remains of high interest as being the oldest relic of fossil man yet found in Europe. It is widely accepted as belonging to the Riss or third glacial period.

(To be continued)

HUMPHREY J. T. JOHNSON

THE DAILY BREVIARY-HYMNS

WITH the best will in the world, we may find it hard really to pray what we recite frequently. But I have found, often, that one line in a hymn, or even one verse in a psalm, may endear itself to me, so that I look forward to it, and so that it radiates back and forth and lights up the rest of the hymn or psalm and gives it greater meaning and value.

The Hymn for Prime at first sight strikes one as very "negative". We instantly ask to be protected from what may hurt us: that our tongue be curbed; our vision veiled; that our hearts may be pure and that we be not proud; that the revolts of our flesh may be ground down by limiting food and drink; and the result is to be our being able to sing glory to God because we have "abstained from the world"—of course, the Latin may mean: "clean by means of abstinence" but the idea remains the same. Though the hymn may have a certain flavour of timidity, of *shrinking* (not suitable even to those who are monks), there is no harm in beginning the day with an "act of humility" (Lauds may very likely have been anticipated): we acknowledge that we advance into a day that may well be dangerous for our souls.

But the line "*Sint pura cordis intima*" must surely be prayed intensely. We know our innermost self so imperfectly! Perhaps we keep our behaviour quite correct—in our circumstances it might even be difficult not to: yet perhaps we detect, sorrowfully, that there was an underlying element of vanity; our

charity may be bitter-sweet—*surgit amari aliquid*; I so easily cheat myself, and shirk a duty for excellent “reasons”. Well, introspection should not be carried too far: probably I shall never probe to my essential self. Only God who “scrutinizes hearts” (Romans viii, 27) knows what is “innermost” in us—may He find that it is His Holy Spirit! We pray God to cleanse the very fountain of our being. Tremendous line, “reaching from end to end”! From God Himself to the mystery of *my* Self.

But at Terce, we turn outwards, under the invasion of the Spirit. We ask that the whole of ourselves may so acknowledge God as to sound through and beyond ourselves. I think that *os* must be “face”, our “expression”: St Ambrose would hardly have written “mouth, tongue”: he used no mere tautology: we ought even to look cheerful (not with the devastating cheeriness of some hospital nurses . . . but even if we feel glum we must try not to look it: one of the first fruits of the Spirit is “joy”. I remember a Wesleyan saying to me when I was not yet a Catholic: “How *can* Father X’s religion be the right one—he always looks so dismal!” At the other extreme, a man in hospital once said to me about a visiting priest: “He’s a very kind gentleman, but *erring on the side of the jocular*. . . .” To resume!) It would have been difficult to insert the heavy word *voluntas* into this tight-packed line; so perhaps *vigor* means “energy” as expressive of will: the whole of us—looks, words, feelings, thoughts and will are to have *God* for their echo: and if, so far, the hymn recalls the Spirit as a “mighty rushing wind”, it now remembers the “baptism of fire”: it wishes the charity that is in us to blaze, not smoulder, and to set our neighbour on fire. Again, this does not mean that we should be tempestuous or “inflammatory”, we may see nothing of the conflagration we desire; but if we truly trust the Holy Spirit in us and operative through us, He cannot *but* produce “results”: a preacher’s deep conviction will do more than any amount of rhetoric. Still, we must *want* God’s fire to communicate itself.

We may envy the splendid dawns and flaming noons of which St Ambrose saw more than we do: but in the second stanza of the hymn for Sext, he grants that there are fires needing to be put out; and God knows that the world’s fever needs to be allayed. It is good to know *enough* about what is going on in

our times—not to argue or theorize about it, nor even only to have a formed opinion about it (which is better indeed than apathy!) but to pray about it. It is the last line of the stanza which, for me, illuminates the whole. “*Veramque pacem cordium*”! It is hard not to be cynical about what is called “peace” nowadays: “They cry ‘Peace, peace!’ where there is no peace”; for certainly there is no peace “of hearts”, and any other kind of peace is not a “true” one. But here again, no amount of pacts, organizations, getting together round tables, are able to produce peace of hearts: only God can reach “*cordis intima*”, and certainly *we* are not going to alter the hearts of Arab and Israelite, Pole and Russian, and all the other couples, or groups, that we easily think of. If daily we make this hymn into a whole-hearted prayer for true peace, we shall be doing much; but, it will include the rinsing out of our own hearts all traditional or personal resentments, or dislikes, for this or that class, nation, or colour; that is, our prayer is sure to need the companionship of deep-reaching spiritual penance.

The hymn for None begins with a line that defies, I think, translation. *Tenax vigor*—here is “vigor” again: the active will of God: to speak human-wise, the whole of God’s will is concentrated on holding the world together, and me within it, and He will not let go. In the second stanza, would that the Breviary “reformers” had not substituted the vague word “lumen” for the lovely, if unusual, “clarum”; I can but hope it was not the “Four Jesuits” who were guilty of this! The Authorized Version has the exquisite phrase (2 Sam. i.e. 2 Kings xxiii, 4) “the clear shining after rain”. We ask, at any rate, that our death may be unclouded. It is not, we feel, too much to remember, once a day, that we are to die.

Our ancestors seem to have brooded over death more than we do. We seldom keep a skull on our writing-table: we do not, like St Aloysius’s grim old battle-scarred grandfather Aloysius Alexander, keep a coffin by our bedside and climb into it nightly “for practice”. He wrote, as part of his epitaph: “Here Aloysius Gonzaga, Marquis, willed to rest, who never rested whilst alive.” There is even a wry humour there; certainly nothing morbid. But even when we have grown old and easily admit that “the night cometh when no man can work”, the

only conclusion shall be that we must work while the light is with us, and pray for perseverance.

Perhaps the hymn for Compline can be treated simply as a "night-prayer", and again we regret that substitution of the colourless "*pro tua clementia*" for "*solita clementia*", which is so consoling and invigorating, and so closely in keeping with the Missal (10th S. after Pentecost): "O God, who makest manifest Thine omnipotence *most chiefly* by sparing and pitying". No doubt the second stanza has in mind chiefly temptations of the flesh, but we can widen this notion to include all the "phantoms" that are apt to beset us not least during insomnia. Tiny accidents of long ago—upsetting a cup over a dress—can loom up and make us blush: or some small mistake of yesterday becomes a major disaster; anxieties about the future become malignant spectres and haunt us in and out of dreams. The only thing to do is to wait, sure of the unfailing goodness of God. The black butterflies in the brain will fold their wings: in the morning, if not sooner, things resume their due proportions; a perspective returns, and with it, courage. Even if we have said Compline earlier this hymn and the prayer *Visita* are good to go to sleep on. Thus we have passed from a humble beginning of the day, to the thought of our apostolate which, by prayer, must be made world-wide: and then, we bring one more from the sum-total of our days to its close, trusting that during such time as remains to us we may still be serving God.

C. C. MARTINDALE, S. J.

CHRIST OUR MEDIATOR

TO the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews it was given to deliver to the Church the great Christian doctrine of the priesthood of the Ascended Christ. "Let us hold fast, then, by the faith we profess. We can claim a great high priest, and one who has passed right up through the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God" (Heb. iv, 14). "A priest's office," Aquinas comments

on this passage, "is to be a mediator between God and the people, forasmuch as he bestows divine blessings on the people and offers up their prayers to God, and in some manner renders satisfaction to God for their sins" (*Summ. Theol.* 3, xxii, 1).

Holy Scripture and Christian tradition alike make it clear that God the Son become Man is the mediator, the spokesman of all our worship that reaches the throne of God. The Latin Bible uses for "high priest" the word *pontifex*, which means, literally, a bridge-maker. In the person of Christ, true God and true Man, God and man meet, and so it is He alone who can span the infinite distance between them. He is the bridge, and it is only when united with Him, vitally incorporated in Him, that we can draw near and endure the impact of the All-Holy Godhead and live in vital union with God's eternal being, life and majesty.

Since the law of prayer is the law of our belief, the language of Christian worship falls into line most strikingly with Scripture and tradition on this all-important, although perhaps insufficiently realized, doctrine. No Catholic would think of doubting the fitness of prayer addressed directly to Christ, yet in the sacrificial worship of the Mass the Church stresses more His priestly, mediatorial office. He is present at Mass as the spokesman of our worship: the principal, invisible priest offering Himself to God with us and for us. We are present to offer ourselves with Him and through Him: *per Ipsum, cum Ipso et in Ipso*, vitally incorporated with Him.

The great eucharistic prayer of the Canon of the Mass is addressed to God the Father *per Christum Dominum nostrum*, and the collects, with very few exceptions, follow the same model. Such, at any rate, was the practice up to the beginning of the eleventh century. About that time, however, under the influence of the Gallican liturgy, ever conscious of the dangers of Arianism which denied the divinity of Christ, collects were admitted addressed to Christ Himself, and the conclusion *Per Christum* discarded as being capable of being understood in a subordinationist sense. But, unfortunately, this resulted also in a weakening of the conception, so strongly emphasized by our Lord Himself, as well as by St Paul, of the high-priestly, media-

torial function of Christ which remains one of the basic ideas of Christian thought ever in need of revived cultivation.¹

There is a prayer in the missal that is most instructive in this connexion and well worth commenting upon:

O God, who didst approve of the different sacrifices of the Mosaic law by reason of the one perfect sacrifice of Christ, accept this sacrifice which Thy devoted servants offer Thee, and hallow it by a blessing like unto that Thou didst bestow on Abel's sacrifice, that so the offering of each may be for the salvation of all (*Secreta* for the seventh Sunday after Pentecost).

This prayer reminds us that whatever value the sacrifices of Abel, Melchizedech or the Aaronic priesthood possessed was on account of the one perfect and all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ. In the Blessed Sacrament chapel of the Lateran basilica two life-size statues of Aaron and Melchizedech flanking the altar are a striking illustration of the doctrine inculcated by this prayer. By the providence of God, who sees and fore-ordains the end from the beginning, the sacrifices offered by Abel, Abraham, Aaron and Melchizedech prepared for, led up to, are united in, and derive all their value from the one perfect and all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, perpetuated, re-enacted and brought to effect in the sacrifice of the Mass.

The end, the goal of the law is Christ (Rom. x, 4). Indeed we go further and say, with St Paul, that Christ is the goal of all creation: all things are gathered up in Him (Eph. i, 10). Even the sacrifices of pagans, "stretching out their arms in yearning for the further shore" (Aeneid vi, 314), were not without their value, and this was derived from and is gathered up in Christ's sacrifice of the Cross and in the Mass. "God, says St Thomas, is at the spring of natural desire . . . which will not be quieted until we know Him" (*Opusc.* xvi, i, 3 ad 4; *Opusc.* xiii, 104). There is some truth and light in all religions—which does not imply that they are all equally good—in that they keep men alive to the sovereign rights of God, and conscious of their own sinfulness, their need of purification and atonement. In this way too the followers of the pagan philosophical systems, by their

¹ See J. A. Jungmann, *Missarum Solemnia*, French edition, Vol. II, pp. 140 seq.

fidelity to the light, were brought into the orbit of the saving grace and mercy of Christ the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. How good it is to realize that the fragmentary bits and pieces of goodness in all of us are gathered up, lest they perish, by Christ and are transfigured and presented by Him before the throne of God.

But Christ is mediator, priest and spokesman not only of mankind and of the whole visible creation: He is mediator, priest and spokesman too of all the hosts of heaven: "It is through Him that the majesty of God is praised by Angels, adored by Dominations, feared by Powers; through Him that the heavens and the celestial Virtues join with the blessed Seraphim in one glad hymn of praise" (Preface to the Canon of the Mass).

When we think of the poverty of our prayers and worship it is reassuring to be told that Christ presents them for us, on our behalf, to God His Father and ours. Indeed "so awful and blessed a thing is Christian prayer that no petition finds its way from man to God without the co-operation of two divine Persons, one working with man on earth, the other for man in heaven. The Spirit inspires prayer, or the desire which can as yet find no full expression in words; and the Son presents it to the Father and claims acceptance for it on the ground of His righteousness, His sacrifice, His exaltation of mankind to the throne of God".¹

"Per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum Filium tuum qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitate Spiritus sancti Deus, per omnia saecula saeculorum." Whoever wrote this grand sonorous Latin phrase, as well as the Christian community who heard it for the first time, was dominated by the splendid vision of the Church on earth having for its Head in heaven, our Lord Jesus Christ returned to His Father in His glorified Body as the first-born among many brethren: the King of a holy people united to Him in the Spirit. And, inversely, that same formula, become living once again, can and should make us familiar with a mode of thought of such capital importance to our whole religious life.

DESMOND SCHLEGEL, O.S.B.

¹ H. B. Swete, *The Ascended Christ*, p. 100.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

THE MORALITY OF BOXING

In a discussion on the morality of boxing matches, a Catholic doctor said that the knock-out blow is not only permitted but encouraged in these encounters, that it is a form of concussion which manifests itself in loss of consciousness for a variable period of time, and that recent neurological investigations by electro-encephalograph indicate abnormal brain waves for a period up to three weeks. In view of the moral objections to other forms of directly intended physical injury, e.g. direct sterilization, how can it be morally lawful to intend such a blow? (C. G. O'L.)

REPLY

Leaving aside the question of legitimate self-defence against an unjust aggressor, which, notwithstanding the traditional description of the "noble art", does not normally arise in boxing matches, the general principle in regard to directly intended physical injuries is that they may not lawfully be inflicted, except in so far as they serve to promote the good of the body as a whole. Needless to say, this principle envisages only injuries which do some real and more than transient harm to the body, because minor bruises can be discounted on the equally valid principle: *parvum pro nihilo reputatur*. Moreover, injuries which are not directly intended even as a means, but are at most foreseen as accidental and unwanted concomitants of one's action or its effect, can be justified, for a proportionate reason, on the principle of the double effect. The answer to the question depends, therefore, on whether the knock-out blow is naturally apt to cause a substantial and more than transient injury, and whether this injury is directly intended, or only indirectly permitted.

As to the nature and extent of the injury normally caused by a knock-out blow, we must confess to being as much in the dark

as some of its recipients appear to be, nor can we expect to get a well-informed opinion from our usual approved authors. In the U.S.A., however, where, according to Father Farraher, S.J.,¹ in 1954, "the four major television networks carried into the nation's homes 197 main-event boxing bouts", of which about one in four ended in knock-outs, Catholic moralists have in recent years been investigating and discussing the question at some length, and at least one of them has made it the subject of a doctoral dissertation.² Reviewing this book, which we have unfortunately been unable to consult, the late Canon Mahoney pointed out that, in the British Isles between 1945 and 1953, no less than sixteen persons died as a result of boxing contests, not to mention the heavier toll of non-fatal serious injuries.³ Father Farraher, in his summary of current literature on the subject,⁴ confirms this picture for the American scene: "American studies," he writes, "seem to show that permanent injury is done to the brain by any severe blow to the head, in spite of gloves and headgear." He quotes indeed only one dissentient, Father Edwin Healy, S.J., who says "These boxers do not do the opponent serious injury. Ordinarily the one who is thus knocked out is simply put into a state where he is unable, for a few minutes, to continue the bout. He is still conscious, though temporarily incapacitated. If at times the man is rendered unconscious, that is merely accidental."

We cannot say whether Father Healy speaks from close experience, but Timothy Murnane, a former amateur boxer of repute, turned writer, presumably does, and he, according to Father Kelly, S.J.,⁵ maintains that the unconscious knock-out is not accidental, that the trained fighter cannot control the terrific power he carries in his punch, and that, in modern prize-fighting at least, if an eye or nose is cut, the opponent's direct object is to damage it yet more. That certainly is the impression one gathers from newspaper accounts of big fights, especially between heavy-weights. It would appear, therefore, that the

¹ *Theological Studies*, June 1955, p. 248, quoting *Collier's*, 17 September 1954, pp. 94 ff.

² *The Morality of Prize-fighting*, by G. C. Bernard, C.S.C. The Catholic University of America Press, 1952.

³ *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, October 1953, p. 635.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*

⁵ *Theological Studies*, March 1941, pp. 75 ff.

doctor quoted by our correspondent is not alone in his contention that a knock-out normally involves a substantial injury.

No one, of course, pretends that the inflicting of substantial injuries is the direct object of boxing as such. In amateur contests, indeed, special precautions are taken to avoid them, e.g. by the use of softer gloves and the prompt termination of any contest in which a participant has received a cut or concussion which might be aggravated by further boxing. Moreover, even in prize-fights, it can be readily conceded that serious injury is not intended as an end in itself, or even as the sole means to the end. Nevertheless, one cannot escape the conclusion that, at least in the professional ring, it is positively and directly envisaged as *one* of the means to victory. The heavy-weight, in particular, is expected to be as savage in his slogging as the rules will allow, and, if possible, to knock his opponent unconscious, as the surest way of ensuring that he does not get up again. True, the rules are satisfied with a temporary incapacitation lasting ten seconds, and, in theory at least, the prize-fighter himself would doubtless be satisfied merely to achieve that; but no one watching him actually deliver his knock-out blow (or trying to) is likely to believe that he is gauging it nicely for a ten-seconds black-out. He hits as hard as he can, and his blow, if it connects, is normally good for much more than ten seconds.

Since our information is almost entirely second-hand, we should prefer not to dogmatize as to what prize-fighters directly intend and what measure of injury they commonly inflict. If, however, when they deliver the knock-out blow, they intend to render their opponent unconscious, even only by way of making sure, or if, as we are sometimes given to understand by sports-writers, they directly seek to open an incapacitating wound in their opponent's face, we cannot see how their action, or that of spectators who share their intention, can be morally justified. It cannot be reconciled with the accepted moral principle regarding the legitimate use of the human body and the avoidance of damage not required for the good of the body as a whole, nor can it be exonerated on the principle of the double effect, because the harm is substantial and directly willed, at least as a means to victory. But if sin is committed, it does not follow that

it will necessarily be grave; that will depend on whether the injury intended or foreseen is grave.

SEMINARY SPIRITUAL DIRECTOR—FULL-TIME AND RESIDENT

The Code of Canon Law states that in every seminary there should be a spiritual director, distinct from the rector. Are there any other directives of the Holy See amplifying this prescription? For example, would it be sufficient, according to the mind of the Church, if the duties of the office were fulfilled by one of the professors, or by a non-resident priest who paid a weekly visit? (Perplexed.)

REPLY

Canon 1358: "Curandum ut in quolibet Seminario adsint rector pro disciplina, magistri pro instructione, oeconomus pro curanda re familiari, a rectore distinctus, duo saltem confessarii ordinarii et director spiritus."

Canon 1360, §1: "Firmo praescripto can. 891, ad munus rectoris, directoris spiritus, confessariorum et magistrorum Seminarii eligantur sacerdotes non doctrina tantum, sed etiam virtutibus ac prudentia praestantes, qui verbo et exemplo alumnis prodesse possint."

S. Congr. de Sem., 2 February 1924, *Formula servanda in relatione de statu Seminarii*, n. 10: "Utrum sit Magister Pietatis, seu Director Spiritualis, debita prudentia, doctrina, pietate ornatus, qui in Seminario degat, nulloque alio officio implicetur (can. 642, §1, 2°, §2; 1358; 1360)."¹

Although it is only in regard to the bursar that the Code expressly stipulates that he must be "a rectore distinctus", it is evident from the nature of the spiritual director's function and from the rule of canon 891, to which we are referred and by which the rector is forbidden normally to hear the confessions

¹ A.A.S., 1925, XVII, p. 549. Canon 642 excludes ex-religious from any office in seminaries and thereby from the office of spiritual director.

of students, that the offices of rector and spiritual director are likewise incompatible. There is, however, no such ruling of the common law which equally clearly forbids a professor to fulfil the function of spiritual director, or excludes the spiritual director altogether from professorial work, or requires him to reside in the Seminary. A private letter of the Congregation of Seminaries, 24 January 1928, to the Ordinaries of the U.S.A., does indeed declare that "the spiritual director, since he must devote all his time to the things of God and the soul, should never, for any reason whatsoever, interfere with the external discipline of the seminary, neither should he occupy himself with tasks incompatible with his true work";¹ but the contents of this letter are styled "recommendations" and, in any case, directly affect only those to whom the letter was addressed. It is true that the above-quoted *formula servanda* in the triennial report on seminaries, which asks whether spiritual director resides in the seminary and is unburdened by any other office, is appended to a general decree which has force of law, but though the decree obliges the local Ordinary "to give an accurate and full reply" to this and other questions, it does not, of itself, bind him to put into effect everything which the phrasing of the questions indicates to be the norm. A question about one's manner of acting is not, in itself, a norm of action.

The form of the question does, of course, indicate that, according to the mind of the Church, the function of spiritual director should not be fulfilled, as an extra, by a professor or by a non-resident priest paying a weekly visit, but until the Congregation of Seminaries declares its will in an authentic interpretation which has general force, or requires the Ordinary responsible for a given seminary to provide a full-time, resident spiritual director, we consider that the law of canon 1358 is substantially observed, as long as there is someone available who can properly be styled the spiritual director. We doubt whether that title can reasonably be applied to a weekly visitor, but the office is not *per se* incompatible with some measure of teaching duty, or with external residence.

¹ Bouscaren, *Digest*, I, p. 650.

ILLEGITIMACY—ADMISSION TO A SEMINARY

In my parish there is a boy of sixteen, the child of parents of mixed religion who attempted marriage in a Registry Office. The marriage was never rectified, but the boy has been cared for by good Catholic relatives. He is now anxious to become a priest. I would be grateful for your advice concerning necessary procedure before he can be admitted into a seminary. (P. P.)

REPLY

Canon 1363, §1: "In Seminarium ab Ordinario ne admitantur, nisi filii legitimi quorum indoles et voluntas spem afferat eos cum fructu ecclesiasticis ministeriis perpetuo inseruituros."

Canon 984: "Sunt irregulares ex defectu: 1°. Illegitimi, sive illegitimitas sit publica sive occulta, nisi fuerint legitimati vel vota sollemnia professi."

Canon 1114: "Legitimi sunt filii concepti aut nati ex matrimonio valido vel putativo, nisi. . ."

Canon 1015, §4: "Matrimonium invalidum dicitur putativum, si in bona fide ab una saltem parte celebratum fuerit, donec utraque pars de eiusdem nullitate certa evadat."

Code Commission, 26 January 1949 (*A.A.S.*, 1949, XLI, p. 158): "An sub verbo 'celebratum' can. 1015, §4, intelligi debeat dumtaxat matrimonium coram Ecclesia celebratum. *R.* Affirmative."

Canon 987: "Sunt simpliciter impediti: 1°. Filii acatholicorum, quandiu parentes in suo errore permaneant" (interpreted by the Code Commission, 16 October 1919, *A.A.S.*, 1919, XI, p. 478, to include the case in which one parent only is a non-Catholic).

In spite of this imposing array of sources, there is an easy way out of the complexities of the case: the parish priest should explain the situation to the local Ordinary, or to any other Ordinary who may be willing to accept the boy as a student

for the priesthood, and leave the rest to him. There are sundry canonical hurdles to surmount, but none of them presents anything in the nature of an insuperable obstacle, provided that the boy is in other respects a suitable candidate.

The obstacles derive from two sources: the invalidity of the union of which the boy was born, and the fact that one of his parents was, and presumably still is, a non-Catholic. They are precautionary rather than punitive. The Church does not want to penalize children for the moral or religious defects of their parents, but, since such defects commonly affect the moral and religious education of children, she bars the way to the seminary and to Holy Orders until she is satisfied that these defects have been supplied or counteracted.

The first question to decide is that of the boy's legitimacy or illegitimacy. Though he was born of an invalid marriage which has never been convalidated, the non-Catholic party to it presumably continues to regard it as valid. From the promulgation of the Code down to 1949, probability could be claimed for the view that such a marriage was canonically putative, and therefore that, by canon 1114, its offspring was legitimate.¹ It is now certain from the above-quoted reply of the Code Commission that a merely civil marriage cannot be classed as putative, at least if, as in the present case, either of the parties was bound to observe the canonical form. Nevertheless, Canon Mahoney was not prepared to abandon altogether the former conclusion as to the legitimacy of the offspring. He maintained that there existed in this country a centenary and immemorial custom of regarding the children of clandestine marriages as legitimate, and that this custom, though now admittedly contrary to the common law, could be sanctioned by the local Ordinary.² The present writer challenged the soundness of this kindly contention, but the Canon stuck to his guns,³ and the Ordinary to whom the case in question is presented may well decide that the Canon's direction-finding was the more accurate. If so, this first obstacle of illegitimacy will be simply by-passed. If not, there should be

¹ Cf. Wernz-Vidal, *Ius Canonicum*, ed. 1928, V, n. 610.

² THE CLERGY REVIEW, July 1950, p. 45.

³ Cf. the correspondence section of this REVIEW for December 1950, and January, February and March 1951.

no major difficulty in surmounting it by a dispensation, assuming that the boy is otherwise an acceptable candidate.¹

The irregularity *ex defectu*, incurred under canon 984, can be surmounted in the same way, if and when the candidate, having proved his worth, seeks admission to Holy Orders; and likewise the simple impediment which derives from the fact that one of his parents is a non-Catholic. Indeed, according to our information, this simple impediment can be dispensed by the local Ordinary himself, in virtue of a faculty granted by the Holy Office, 26 February 1949, to the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales.

THE BREVIARY OBLIGATION

Is there still unanimous agreement among theologians as to the gravity of the obligation of daily recitation of the breviary; and, if so, is there any greater relaxation of this rule conceded to the secular clergy because of the increased stress, with absence of mental tranquillity, to which, as the Sacred Congregation of Rites has noted, they are nowadays subject? What, in your view, would excuse the parochial clergy from this obligation on a Sunday? Finally, does it not seem strange that priests are bound to daily recitation of the breviary and yet not to daily celebration of Mass? (X.)

REPLY

Canon 135: "Clerici, in maioribus ordinibus constituti, exceptis iis de quibus in can. 213, 214, tenentur obligatione quotidie horas canonicas integre recitandi secundum proprios et probatos liturgicos libros."

i. As far as we know, there is no sign of a break in the unanimous agreement of theologians that the daily obligation of the

¹ According to several commentators, Apostolic Delegates have the faculty "permittendi ingressum in seminarium illegitimus, dummodo non agitur de adulterinis aut sacrilegis, si de cetero conditiones ad ingressum in pium locum necessariae habeantur, et firma obligatione recurrendi ad S. Sedem pro eorum Ordinatione". Cf. Beste, *Introductio in Codicem*, p. 644.

canonical hours (which was introduced by custom and became written law for the first time in canon 135) is grave in grave matter, and that the measure of a grave omission is a Little Hour, or, in the other sections, a continuous portion somewhat larger than a Little Hour. In fact, the currently popular manuals commonly base both these assertions precisely on the fact of general agreement,¹ and the latest arrivals simply swell the general chorus.²

There is the same unanimity among these authors in regard to excusing causes. Indeed, if our correspondent will consult his favourite manual, he can be more or less sure that what it says, both in regard to the categories of excuses and the accepted examples, is repeated almost *verbatim* in every similar manual going back *via* St Alphonsus to Busembaum (1600-68), or fresh from the Press. In particular, they all agree that physical infirmity, such that one cannot recite or complete the day's office without a grave inconvenience, or the probability of inducing a grave inconvenience, e.g. a bad headache or sense of exhaustion, constitutes an excuse; and that the same is true of a heavy and unavoidable occupation of duty or charity which takes up most of the day, e.g. seven to ten hours, and which, when due allowance has been made for refreshment and necessary repose, leaves insufficient time for the recitation or completion of the office.³ On the other hand, they all insist that the excuse of unavoidable obstacles must be out of the ordinary (otherwise one must either rearrange one's work or seek a dispensation through the proper channels); and that, if the grave inconvenience extends only to part of the day's office, the rest remains obligatory.⁴

¹ E.g. Genicot-Gortebecke, *Inst. T. M.*, II, n. 746; Noldin-Schmitt, *Summa T. M.*, II, n. 757; Prummer, *Manuale T. M.*, II, n. 362; Vermeersch, *T. M.*, III, n. 40.

² E.g. Jorio, *T. M.* (1946), II, n. 995; Fanfani, *Manuale T. M.* (1950), III, n. 309 C; Regatillo-Zalba, *De Statibus Particularibus* (1954), n. 70.

³ Vermeersch adds however: "Ecclesia sacerdotem non obligat ut necessario somno vel opportuna corporis refectione se privet ad brevium recitandum, si aliter impeditus fuerit, v.g. tempore missionum vel exercitiorum. Qui autem ordinem servat in negotiis suis, fere semper inveniet tempus sufficiens ad persolvendum officium. Quare valde hortandi sunt sacerdotes ut consuetudinem differendi officium ad nocturnum tempus omnino dimittant" (loc. cit., n. 41).

⁴ Innocent XI condemned the proposition: "Qui non potest recitare Matutinum et Laudes, potest autem reliquas Horas, ad nihil tenetur; quia maior pars trahit ad se minorem" (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 1204).

We have been unable to detect any explicit tendency among modern authors to make further concessions to the pastoral clergy of today, by reason of the "increased stress" to which they are subject. The latest manuals make no additions to the typical examples of grave inconvenience instanced by St Alphonsus in the eighteenth century, and we have found no evidence (not even in the abundant files of the late Canon Mahoney) of pressure in the periodicals for a more benign interpretation of the obligation. The cynic may perhaps be tempted to ascribe this conservatism to the immunity from stress and strain which moral theologians, immured in the seclusion of their ivory castles, are reputedly able to enjoy. We prefer, however, to attribute it, first, to their sense of the primary importance of the *opus Dei* in the life of even the busiest priest, and secondly, to their realization of the fact that, if modern life calls for a relaxation of this primary duty of prayer, it is for the Church to concede it. As all are aware, the Church has recently seen fit to ease the burden on the clergy generally, in the decree *Cum Nostra* and, as the opening words of the decree explain, precisely for the reasons urged by our correspondent.¹ It would be surprising if, now that the Church herself has defined the limits of the concessions she is currently prepared to make to the strain of modern pastoral life, the moral theologians were promptly to relax the law still further by conceding the excuse of a *grave incommodum* to any pastor who had had a busy day.

ii. As to what would excuse the parochial clergy from recitation of the breviary on a Sunday, it is impossible, from the very nature of the case, to suggest any general rules, either as to the nature of the work, or as to the number of hours it must occupy,² because the validity of the excuse will necessarily depend on the physical fitness and resilience of the individual priest. One will be relatively full of bounce after a full Sunday, with several Masses and instructions, and another will be prostrate after a single late Mass with sermon. The authors recommend, however, that those who feel they have a genuine excuse

¹ "Cum nostra hac aetate sacerdotes, praesertim illi qui curam animarum gerunt, variis novisque in dies apostolatus officiis onerentur, ita ut divini officii recitationi ea qua oportet animi tranquillitate vix attendere possint. . . ." (THE CLERGY REVIEW, June 1955, p. 355.)

² Cf. Prummer, loc. cit., n. 379.

should put it to their spiritual adviser and, if it is likely to be habitual, seek a dispensation through the local Ordinary.

iii. We do not think it strange that priests are bound to daily recitation of the breviary and yet not to the daily celebration of Mass. It is natural that the Church should be chary of imposing, as a daily obligation, any act which of its nature requires one to be in the state of grace. Thus, whereas the original text of the Instruction on the new Holy Week called upon all the clergy to assist at the Holy Thursday evening Mass, and added the clause, "ad sacram mensam accessuri" (which seemed to imply a command), the authentic text, promulgated in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, revised this phrase to: "quos expedit ad sacram mensam accedere".¹

THE THEATRE LAW AND VISITING CLERICS

As an American visitor who, in good faith, has attended performances at Glynedebourne, the "Old Vic", etc., I should like to know: (i) whether the Westminster theatre law, elucidated in your REVIEW (October 1954, p. 622; August 1955, p. 483), is limited to theatrical presentations strictly so called, or covers also cinemas, operas, concerts, etc.; and (ii) whether visiting clerics are subject to the law and its penal sanction? (W. K.)

REPLY

Conc. Prov. Westm., I, decr. xxiv, 2; IV, decr. xi, 9: "Prohibemus districtè ne ecclesiastici sacris ordinibus initiati scenicis spectaculis in publicis theatris, vel in locis theatri publici usus ad tempus inservientibus, intersint, imponentes transgressoribus poenam suspensionis ipso facto incurrendam, hactenus ubique in Anglia vigentem, cum reservatione respectivo Ordinario."

Canon 14, §1, 2°: "(Peregrini non adstringuntur) legibus territorii in quo versantur, iis exceptis quae ordini publico consulunt, vel actuum solemnità determinant."

Canon 140: "Spectaculis, choreis et pompis quae eos dede-

¹ Cf. THE CLERGY REVIEW, February 1956, p. 117.

cent, vel quibus clericos interesse scandalo sit, praesertim in publicis theatris, ne intersint."

i. The term used in the synodal law is "scenica spectacula", which, etymologically translated, means "stage shows". It is, no doubt deliberately, a term of wide connotation, but, in view of the penal character of the law, one is justified in restricting it at least to shows in which the σκηνή, i.e. stage, is integral to the performance. We should therefore define "scenica spectacula" as dramatic representations in which the stage, with or without appropriate scenery, is not just a raised platform which enables the performers the better to be seen or heard, but is accepted in the mind of the spectators as the actual scene of the events portrayed. Thus understood, the term does not cover concerts given from a stage which serves as a mere platform, even if the performers wear appropriate costume and are helped out by suitable scenery; but it must, in our view, be taken to cover all plays, operas, operettas, musical comedies, and reviews consisting of successive dramatic sketches.¹ On the other hand, it does not cover cinematograph shows, because they are not, properly speaking, "stage shows" and were not indeed in existence when the law was formulated.

ii. As to whether the law binds *peregrini*,² depends on whether the synodal law was or was not made "in the interests of public order", in the sense of canon 14. This is a new formula in canon law, on the interpretation of which commentators are not altogether agreed. Since, however, it cannot very well be a mere variant of *pro bono publico* (for all laws must have that in view), it is best taken to refer to laws "quae ad commune damnum avertendum, potius quam ad promovendum bonum commune latae sunt"³, e.g. laws made to guard against public scandal or disturbance.

Now, it is evident that a theatre law affecting clerics may have been designed "in the interests of public order", and it is certain that it must be so interpreted, if its clear purpose is to avoid public scandal, or if the competent authority has made a

¹ On the principle, *parvum pro nihilo reputatur*, a concert punctuated by an occasional dramatic sketch remains a mere concert.

² Canon 91: "Persona dicitur . . . *peregrinus*, si versatur extra domicilium et quasi-domicilium quod adhuc retinet."

³ Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome Iuris Canonici*, I, n. 83.

declaration to this effect.¹ Failing, however, any such clear evidence of this kind, one may reasonably assume that the object of the law is not primarily to maintain public order, but to promote the greater sanctity of the clergy by excluding them from public gatherings which, even when perfectly innocent in themselves, are commonly surrounded with an atmosphere of worldliness.² This assumption is not only more complimentary to the clergy, by taking it for granted that they will spontaneously avoid anything scandalous, but would seem to be warranted by the social context of the Westminster statute, which was first formulated in 1852, when the English stage was much less given to unseemly themes and modes of presentation than it is today. If this interpretation of the object of our statute be probable, and we think it is, then, *secluso scandalo*, visiting priests are not subject to the prohibition or its penal sanction. They are, of course, subject to the common law of canon 140, but this merely reasserts the natural moral obligation, incumbent on clerics, to avoid anything which ill befits their state, or at which their presence would give scandal.

A few authors³ have indeed suggested that *peregrini* are automatically subject to local penal laws, because, by canon 1566, §1, "ratione delicti reus forum sortitur in loco patrat delicti"; but the canon assumes that a crime, i.e. an act contrary to a penal law, has been committed, which is precisely the point at issue; and its purpose is clearly not to determine who are subject to the law concerned, but who is competent to pass judgment on subjects who violate it.

L. L. McR.

POSTURE OF THE CONGREGATION AT MASS

Some writers, anxious to increase popular participation in Mass, recommend that Low Mass should be treated as if it

¹ E.g. the decree of the Cardinal Vicar, 25 May 1918 (*A.A.S.*, 1918, X, p. 300), for the city of Rome, and that of the Fifth Provincial Council of Malines, 1937, for Belgium.

² Cf. Van Hove, in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 1924, p. 161. It will be noted that canon 140 couples "spectacula" with "pompa" which can best be translated as "worldly gatherings".

³ E.g. Maroto, *Institutiones Iuris Canonici*, I, n. 201.

were High Mass, and that the people should act as they would (or should) at this latter. Is this permissible? (P. Q.)

REPLY

There is only one general rubric in the Roman Missal dealing with the congregation at Mass. It is the general rubric xvii, 2, which reads: "Circumstantes in missis privatis semper genua flectant, etiam tempore Paschali, praeterquam dum legitur Evangelium." By a "private Mass" in the rubrics is, normally, meant a low non-conventual Mass. In view of the present ardent desire of the Holy See that the people should take an active part in the Sacred Liturgy, it would seem that this rubric need not be too strictly interpreted. The correct posture for the different parts of a high or sung Mass involves a good deal of movement (it has its advantages in keeping people awake), and it is doubtful if this would be altogether suitable for a low Mass celebrated in a crowded church as quickly as possible (this is *sometimes* necessary, e.g. in a church where there is a Mass every half hour on a Sunday). On the other hand, at more important Masses, such as a Dialogue Mass or the chief Mass on Sundays, when more time is available and it is especially desired to get the people to take an active part in their celebration, it would seem quite lawful—in this period of transition from a completely passive part in the Liturgy to one of full activity, so desired by the Church—that the people be trained to stand, sit or kneel as they should at a high or sung Mass.

THE PRINCIPAL MASS

Extra candles and two servers are—on greater days—permitted at the principal Mass, but what is the principal Mass to which this rule applies? (P. Q.)

REPLY

If there is a high or sung Mass that is the principal Mass. If all the Masses are low Masses, and the church is a parish

church, the "parochial Mass", i.e. that celebrated, normally, by the parish priest (usually, too, applied for his people), is the chief Mass. In other cases it is, presumably, for the priest in charge to decide what is really the principal Mass in his church and apply the rules to that one. Obviously, in convents, schools, etc., the principal Mass is the one attended by the Community as a whole.

COMMUNION OF THE SICK WITHIN MASS

If a priest celebrates Mass in a chapel near a room where a sick person lies, may he take Communion to that person during Mass? (M. N.)

REPLY

It is not lawful to give Holy Communion *during Mass* to a person so distant from the altar that the celebrant loses sight of it in doing so. This is the legislation of the Code of Canon Law (canon 868), and is repeated in the Roman Ritual (V, i, 17). Some canonists (e.g. Cappello, Claeys Bouuaert-Simenon) interpret this canon as applying to places outside the church or oratory in which Mass is being celebrated, so that Communion might be taken to a person who is within the church or oratory even though out of sight. Before the Code, *S.R.C.*, in 1874 (No. 3322), was asked by the Superior General of the nursing Brothers of St John of God if Communion might be given within Mass in their hospitals even to patients not in the room in which Mass was celebrated, but in a room nearby where the celebrant would lose sight of the altar, but in which his voice could be heard from the altar. The Congregation replied "*Nihil obstat*", provided that the *umbella* (ceremonial umbrella) was carried over the Blessed Sacrament. Probably this decision has been abrogated by canon 868. In the sources cited for this canon *S.R.C.* 3322 is not given. However, a few writers—notably *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 1951, p. 63—think that the decision of 1874 may still be availed of in hospitals. If the voice of the celebrant is heard where the sick person is only through some

artificial means (e.g. a loud speaker), it would seem that Holy Communion may not be given to him during Mass, but must be made a separate function following the rite of Communion of the sick (*R.R.*, V, iv).

J. B. O'C.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS
AN INDULGENCED PRAYER
SACRA PAENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA
(OFFICIUM DE INDULGENTIIS)

ORATIO AD BEATAM VIRGINEM MARIAM, A SUMMO PONTIFICE PIO XII
EXARATA, INDULGENTIIS DITATUR (*A.A.S.*, 1956, XLVIII, p. 98).

O Vergine, bella come la luna, delizia del cielo, nel cui volto guardano i beati e si specchiano gli angeli, fa che noi, tuoi figliuoli, ti assomigliamo e che le nostre anime ricevano un raggio della tua bellezza, che non tramonta con gli anni, ma che rifulge nell'eternità.

O Maria, sole del cielo, risveglia la vita dovunque è morte e rischiara gli spiriti dove sono le tenebre. Rispecchiandoti nel volto dei tuoi figli, concedi a noi un riflesso del tuo lume e del tuo fervore.

O Maria, forte come un esercito, dona alle nostre schiere la vittoria. Siamo tanto deboli, e il nostro nemico inferisce con tanta superbia. Ma con la tua bandiera ci sentiamo sicuri di vincerlo; egli conosce il vigore del tuo piede, egli teme la maestà del tuo, sguardo. Salvaci, o Maria, bella come la luna, eletta come il sole forte come un esercito schierato, sorretto non dall'odio, ma dalla fiamma dell'amore. Così sia.

Die 17 Ianuarii 1956

Ss̃mus D. N. Pius div. Prov. Pp. XII benigne tribuere dignatus est partialem quingentorum dierum Indulgentiam a christifidelibus saltem corde contrito acquirendam quoties supra relatum orationem devote recitaverint. Contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

N. Card. CANALI, *Paenitentiarius Maior*

S. Luzio, *Regens*

THE NEW HOLY WEEK ACCORDING TO
THE SIMPLE RITE

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

DECLARATIO

CIRCA FUNCTIONES "TRIDUI SACRI" SECUNDUM ORDINEM HEBDOMADAE
SANCTAE INSTAURATUM (A.A.S., 1956, XLVIII, p. 153).

In Ordine hebdomadae sanctae instaurato, praeter rubricas de sacrorum rituum celebratione solemni, id est *cum* ministris sacris, rubricae adduntur pro eorundem rituum celebratione simplici, id est *sine* ministris sacris, eo sane proposito ut eorundem rituum celebratio facilius reddatur in omnibus ecclesiis vel oratoriis publicis et semipublicis.

Cum vero circa hanc rem dubia quaedam orta sint, S. Rituum Congregatio sequentia declaravit ac statuit:

1. In omnibus ecclesiis et oratoriis publicis et semipublicis, ubi copia habeatur sacrorum ministrorum, sacri ritus dominicae II Passionis seu in Palmis, feriae V in Cena Domini, feriae VI in Passione et Morte Domini et Vigiliae paschalis, in forma solemni celebrari possunt (*Instructio*, n. 4).

2. In ecclesiis autem et in oratoriis publicis et semipublicis, ubi sacri ministri desunt, ritus simplex adhiberi potest. Ad praefatum autem ritum simplicem peragendum, requiritur numerus sufficiens "ministrantium", sive clericorum, sive saltem puerorum, et quidem trium ad minus pro dominica II Passionis seu in Palmis et pro Missa in Cena Domini; et quatuor saltem in celebratione Actionis liturgicae feria VI in Passione et Morte Domini et Vigiliae paschalis. Hi autem "ministrantes" sedulo instructi esse debent de iis quae ab ipsis agenda sunt (*Instructio*, n. 3). Duplex haec conditio, scilicet de sufficienti numero "ministrantium" et de eorundem congrua praeparatione, prorsus requiritur ad ritum simplicem peragendum. Ordinarii loci invigilent ut haec duplex conditio, pro eodem ritu simplici statuta, adamussim observetur.

3. Ubi feria V hebdomadae sanctae, post Missam in Cena Domini, etiam in forma simplici celebratam, translatio et repositio habeatur Ssñi Sacramenti, stricte requiritur ut in eadem ecclesia vel oratorio, Actio quoque liturgica postmeridiana feriae VI in Passione et Morte Domini locum habeat.

4. Si quacumque de causa Missa in Cena Domini etiam ritu simplici celebrari non possit, Ordinarius loci, ratione pastoralis,

binas Missas lectas permittere poterit in ecclesiis vel oratoriis publicis litandas, unam vero tantum Missam lectam in oratoriis semipublicis (*Instructio*, n. 17); servato *Decreto*, n. 7, quoad tempus celebrationis earundem Missarum.

5. Vigilia paschalis celebrari potest etiam in ecclesiis vel oratoriis ubi functiones feriae V et VI locum non habuerint, vel omitti in ecclesiis vel oratoriis in quibus praefatae functiones celebratae sunt.

6. Sacerdotibus qui curam duarum vel plurium habeant parochiarum, Ordinarius loci permittere potest binationem Missae in Cena Domini, repetitionem Actionis liturgicae feriae VI in Passione et Morte Domini, et binationem Missae Vigiliae paschalis; non tamen in eadem parochia; et servatis semper iis quae statuta sunt quoad tempus celebrationis (*Decretum*, n. 7).

Quibus omnibus Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Pio Pp. XII ab infrascripto Cardinali, S. Rituum Congregationis Praefecto, per singula relatis, Sanctitas Sua hanc eandem declarationem et resolutiones approbare dignata est.

Contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

Die 15 Martii anni 1956.

C. Card. CICOGNANI, *Praefectus*

† A. Carinci, Archiep. Seleuc., *a secretis*

PROHIBITION OF "SITUATIONAL ETHICS"

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

INSTRUCTIO

AD ORDINARIOS OMNES NECNON AD MAGISTROS IN SEMINARIIS, IN ATHENAEIS, VEL IN STUDIORUM UNIVERSITATIBUS DOCENTES ET AD LECTORES IN STUDIORUM DOMIBUS RELIGIOSORUM: DE "ETHICA SITUATIONIS" (*A.S.A.*, 1956, XLVIII, p. 144).

Contra doctrinam moralem eiusque applicationem in Ecclesia catholica traditam multis in regionibus etiam inter catholicos spargi coepit systema ethicum quod plerumque nomine cuiusdam "Ethicae Situationis" venit, quamque dicunt non dependere a principiis ethicae obiectivae (quae ultimam in "Esse" fundatur), sed cum ea non solum in eadem linea poni, sed eidem superordinari.

Auctores qui hoc systema sequuntur decisivam et ultimam agendi

normam statuunt non esse ordinem obiectivum rectum, naturae lege determinatum et ex hac lege certo cognitum, sed intimum aliquod mentis uniuscuiusque individui iudicium ac lumen, quo ei in concreta situatione posito innotescit quid sibi agendum sit. Haec igitur hominis ultima decisio secundum eos non est, sicut ethica obiectiva apud auctores maioris momenti tradita docet, legis obiectivae ad particularem casum applicatio, attentis simul ac ponderatis, secundum regulas prudentiae, particularibus "situationis" adiunctis, sed immediatum illud internum lumen et iudicium. Hoc iudicium saltem multis in rebus ultimatum nulla norma obiectiva, extra hominem posita atque ab eius persuasione subiectiva independente, quoad suam obiectivam rectitudinem ac veritatem est mensuratum, neque mensurandum neque mensurabile, sed sibi ipsi plene sufficit.

Secundum hos auctores "naturae humanae" conceptus traditionalis non sufficit, sed recurrendum est ad conceptum naturae humanae "exsistentis" qui quoad plurima non habet valorem obiectivum absolutum, sed relativum tantum ideoque mutabilem, exceptis fortasse illis paucis elementis atque principiis quae ad naturam humanam metaphysicam (absolutam et immutabilem) spectant. Eiusdem valoris tantum relativi est traditionalis conceptus "legis naturae". Perplura autem quae hodie circumferuntur tamquam legis naturae postulata absoluta, nituntur secundum eorum opinionem et doctrinam in dicto conceptu naturae exsistentis, ideoque non sunt nisi relativa et mutabilia atque omni semper situationi adaptari queunt.

Acceptis atque ad rem deductis his principiis, dicunt atque docent homines in sua quisque conscientia non imprimis secundum leges obiectivas, sed mediante lumine illo interno individuali secundum intuitionem personalem iudicantes, quid ipsis in praesenti situatione agendum sit, a multis conflictibus ethicis aliter insolubilibus praeservari vel facile liberari.

Multa quae in huius "Ethicae Situationis" systemate statuuntur, rei veritati saneaeque rationis dictamini contraria sunt, relativismi et modernismi vestigia produnt, a doctrina catholica per saecula tradita longe aberrant. Variis systematibus Ethicae non catholicae in non paucis assertis affinia sunt.

Quibus perpensis, ad avertendum "Novae Moralis" periculum de quo Summus Pontifex Pius Pp. XII in Allocutionibus diebus 23 Martii et 18 Aprilis 1952 habitis locutus est,¹ et ad doctrinae catholicae puritatem et securitatem tuendam, haec Suprema Sacra Congregatio Sancti Officii interdicat et prohibet hanc "Ethicae Situationis" doctrinam, quovis nomine designetur, in Univer-

¹ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, vol. XLIV (1952), p. 270 ss. et p. 413 ss.

sitatibus, Athenaeis, Seminariis et religiosorum formationis domibus tradi vel approbari, sut in libris, dissertationibus, acroasibus seu, ut aiunt, conferentiis, vel quocumque alio modo propagari atque defendi.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus S. S. Congregationis S. Officii, die 2 Februarii a. 1956.

✠ I. Card. PIZZARDO, Ep. Albanensis, *Secretarius*.

BOOK REVIEWS

Species Revalued. By D. Murray. Pp. 166. (Blackfriars Publications, London, 1955.)

THE species problem is a chronic source of biological dispute. Some biologists hold that the problem is fictitious and a consequence of systematists becoming bogged in a conceptual morass of their own devising. Other biologists hold that there is no special characteristic distinguishing species from varieties, on the one hand, or genera, on the other. Yet others, however, have a feeling that species are, on the whole, "natural" and well-demarcated assemblages of organisms, but that the criteria for specific distinction are peculiarly difficult to define. Father Murray, who combines the Dominican philosophic bent with fellowship of the Royal Entomological Society, assembles the evidence in favour of regarding species as well demarcated groups, and probes its significance.

The book opens with an elementary account of the species concept during the last few hundred years. This is followed, rather abruptly, by a disquisition on the nature of scientific law and by an unsatisfying exposition of the teleological argument for the existence of God, leaning heavily on Paley. Natural selection is expounded next. Then an account is given of the general character of the fossil record, with an emphasis on the rarity of intermediate forms. The important subject of interspecific barriers is given a chapter of its own, with examples of extreme specialization drawn from flower-insect relations; this topic is developed in the two succeeding chapters.

The significance of sexual differentiation is assessed next, the author taking the view that sex is a "fundamental law" and "one of the greatest mysteries in creation"; the commonly held view that sexual differentiation has been favoured by natural selection since it conserves variability and enables a genetic population to adapt

itself to changed environmental conditions is not regarded sympathetically. After this, the author considers the definition of biological species, which he regards as natural entities, usually of great antiquity.

The final two chapters discuss the impact of Darwinism on human thought and behaviour and are largely based on Clark's book *Darwin: Before and After*.

Perhaps the most useful contributions made by Father Murray are his theses that species only intergrade exceptionally, that many of the characters most important in classification are probably devoid of selective significance, and that it is hard to envisage how a number of complex organs or behaviour patterns could have been developed gradually under the influence of natural selection. Father Murray is rather reticent in stating plainly what his views on evolution are but seems to favour the special creation of multitudinous forms with subsequent, very limited, intraspecific variation.

It is not easy to assess the force of Father Murray's arguments. He is at his best in dealing with questions of insect taxonomy in which he has specialized. His general attitude that biology is a necessary component of contemporary culture is heartening too. His theoretical views seem to derive largely from those of Father Cotter and Dr Clark and are not developed with the necessary cogency. Like so many critics of neo-Darwinism, he deals with evolution and its causes *in globo*. This is misguided since, while there is no scientifically satisfactory alternative today to some sort of general theory of evolution, there are plenty of grounds, several of them pointed out by Father Murray, for criticizing the neo-Darwinian attempts to locate the underlying causes.

Father Murray's treatment of natural selection is most unsatisfactory and his statement that "its strength and its intellectual attractions consist in the supposition that laws do not exist" and that it "puts blind necessity everywhere in the place of final causes" is a travesty of the situation and seems to carry with it a metaphysically defective notion of final cause. Indeed, how many scholastic philosophers would concur with Father Murray in stating that purpose is "the last link in the chain of causes"? The assertion that "design leads us to consider species as separate entities in nature" is also not substantiated in the text.

In dealing with the fossil record, Father Murray quite rightly stresses the infrequency of intermediates. However, he ought, in quoting Dr Simpson's views on this subject, to give also his explanation, namely that new taxonomic groups usually arise in small rapidly evolving populations whose chance of survival as fossils would obviously be slight.

The author's apparent unfamiliarity with various of the scientific topics treated by him considerably diminishes the value of the book. Thus the fossil brachiopod *Lingula*, misspelt *Lingulla*, is referred to on p. 41 as a mollusc; chitin, on p. 92, is described as "a nitrogenous polysaccharide with an empirical formula", as if some substances were without one, and the quite unsubstantiated claim is made on p. 134 that gene mutations "will never be changes of a constructive kind".

It is difficult to avoid concluding that in spite of the obvious good intentions of the author, he is insufficiently equipped with the relevant scientific data to substantiate his criticisms of the extremely complex issues of current evolutionary theory, granting, however, that much criticism is indeed called for. It is to be regretted that the grammar and orthography of the entire book are remarkably bad.

R. H. RICHENS

Matters Liturgical. By Wuest Mullaney Barry, C.S.S.R. Pp. xxvi + 1171. (Frederick Pustet Co., New York, and B. Herder, London, 1956. Price 56s.)

THIS is a remarkable book. It was first published by Father Wuest in 1889 in Latin. In 1925 the first edition in English by Father Mullaney was issued, and by 1948, when he died, seven editions had seen the light of day. This eighth edition—much improved and enlarged—was prepared by Father W. T. Barry of New York. In its 1171 pages the book covers an extraordinary amount of ground, concerning sacred places, sacred things, sacred rites (the Mass, Divine Office, the seven sacraments, miscellaneous functions), and sacred times (the liturgical year). It deals not only with the general rubrics of the Roman Missal, Breviary and Ritual, but also with much actual ceremonial and most of the Canon Law concerning the sacraments. It is a real encyclopaedia of "matters liturgical" and its treatment of each subject is not superficial but very complete, and all its statements are documented—a very valuable feature of the book.

What matters most in a book of this kind is its accuracy and the accuracy of *Matters Liturgical*—with its immense amount of detail—is impeccable. The book is completed by a good index and a very useful list of the canons of the Code of Canon Law with which it deals.

The book is fully up to date, embodying the provisions of the decree *Cum nostra* (S.R.C., 23 March 1955) on the simplification of the rubrics of the Breviary and Missal; and a loose supplement gives the new legislation of the *Ordo Hebdomadae Sanctae Instauratus* (S.R.C.,

30 November 1955). Curiously enough, seeing that the book is an American one, it does not deal with the new Ritual of U.S.A., *Collectio Rituum*, which was sanctioned by S.R.C. for the dioceses of North America by a Rescript of 3 June 1954.

English readers of the book must understand that all through "high Mass" is what we call "sung Mass" (*Missa cantata*); "can" is used where we would use "may"; and "frontal" is used (on p. 239) for "frontlet", while for us it is a synonym for "antependium".

It is remarkable to find (p. 189) in such a very accurate treatment of liturgical law this statement about an alb: "the whole skirt may be made of lace". No. An alb is a linen garment. If lace is used to ornament it—and it is of questionable value—it must remain a mere accessory, and not become a principal. There is no reason why the celebrant of Mass should remove his chasuble or maniple (pp. 195, 209) if he preaches. The Bishop at Pontifical Mass preaches in all his vestments, so does his assistant priest (*Ceremonial of Bishops*, I, vii, 4; viii, 48), for the homily is part of the Mass. If a bishop officiates at a marriage (p. 211), he wears a cope (*Pontificale Romanum*). There is no longer any doubt that the Mass of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, 22 August, may be used as a votive Mass (*Ordo Universalis Ecclesiae*, Rome, 1956, p. ix). While the Apostolic Blessing *in articulo mortis* is usually given after Confession and Holy Communion (Roman Ritual, VI, vi, 1), the reception of these sacraments is not one of the conditions for the gaining of the plenary indulgence (p. 724).

Matters Liturgical is a book that merits cordial and unreserved commendation, but, alas! it is to be feared that its high price will place it beyond the reach of many in non-dollar countries to whom it would be of inestimable value.

Collection "*Paroisse et Liturgie*": No. 10, *Initiation des Enfants à la Liturgie*; No. 11, *Catéchèse Biblique et Liturgique*. (Apostolat Liturgique, Abbaye de Saint-André, Bruges, 1954, 1955.)

THE well-known liturgical review *Paroisse et Liturgie* which is published by the Benedictine Fathers of the Abbey of S. Andrew, Bruges, busies itself a great deal with the pastoral side of the S. Liturgy, and has published many articles with valuable suggestions for the apostolate of the Liturgy among the people. If these are to take that active share in the sacred functions that is so warmly desired by the Holy See they need a graduated, carefully planned initiation into liturgical and biblical ideas. They have to learn that the Mass is a Community act, that it is something at which they must not only be present on days of obligation, but in which they

must play an active part; that they have come to church not to say their own private prayers, but to share in a great *act*, the sacramental re-presentation of the sacrifice of Calvary, in the offering of which they now—with Christ, his Church, his priest—take part.

Liturgical education must be begun with children and a serious and prolonged attempt made to explain to them in simple terms, and arouse their interest in, the church in which they worship—its purpose, its equipment—and the functions at which they are present, so that they may understand something about the great drama of the Mass and the administration of the sacraments, and the part they themselves are called to play in all this.

The articles of the review that dealt with this initiation of children have now been gathered together and published by a committee of priests. Although they were written for Belgian and French children they will be of great value for priests and teachers everywhere who are striving to solve the acute problem of children in church.

The second volume (No. 11 of the series) by Rev. Paul Sauvageot gives a valuable series of catechetical instructions, based especially on the Bible, for the liturgical year, arranged to suit the three usual school terms. They are intended for children of about eleven or twelve years old. They will be of great help to those who have the responsible task of teaching children how to worship in the Church's own way.

The Rites of Holy Week. By Rev. F. R. McManus. Pp. xi + 146. (St Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, New Jersey, 1956. Price not stated.)

THE appearance of the new *Ordo Hebdomadae Sanctae Instauratus* at the beginning of the year called for the hasty preparation and production of books for the people, giving the rites and their translation, and of one for priests and their assistants dealing with the ceremonial. A minor flood of the former arose in U.S.A. where some thirteen or fourteen manuals made their appearance in contrast to one in Great Britain and one in Ireland; while that country, alone of the English-speaking countries, published one or two books on the ceremonial.

Father McManus, despite the fact that his book had to be written and produced at high speed, has accomplished his task with remarkable competence. His book is excellent. In addition to a detailed description of the ceremonies of each day of Holy Week he gives: (i) a résumé of the decree and Instruction of the Congregation of Sacred Rites (the full text of these is given, in English, in an appendix); (ii) material for the preparation of the people for the new

rites, and suggestions for a commentary and direction during the actual functions so as to give the necessary lead to the congregation for their singing and the responses; (iii) a chapter on the music of Holy Week; (iv) most useful notes on the duties of a sacristan during each function; (v) ceremonial directions for the congregation that those present may take a really active part in the liturgy, as the Church desires; (vi) some notes on the changes in the Divine Office for the week; (vii) excellent diagrams to aid in making the ceremonial directions quite clear.

Father McManus's exposition of the text of the *Ordo* and his comments on it are remarkable for their impeccable accuracy. It would seem that the celebrant on Palm Sunday does not carry a palm in the procession, no provision is made for him in the rubric to receive or carry one (as in the former rite), and does he not represent Christ in whose honour the palms are carried? The prayer for the blessing of the fire on Holy Saturday (p. 90), and of the incense grains (p. 91) are, apparently, not sung. The rubric says *dicens*, in contrast to the rubric for other prayers (*dicens in tono orationis ferialis*, or *in tono feriali*), and in keeping with the rubric of the Ceremonial of Bishops (I, xxvii, 3), which—for the old rite—says these two prayers *leguntur*. And isn't the action of the celebrant over the baptismal water and around the candle plunged in it (p. 97) a blowing (*exsufflans*) in contrast to the preceding breathing (*halat*)?

Father McManus has provided the clergy with an excellent provisional manual of the ceremonial of Holy Week. It is still too soon to write a completely satisfactory book on this matter. Although the rubrics of the new *Ordo* are quite full and clear, many queries arise in attempting to put them into practice, and we must await the official answers to problems by S.R.C., or the quasi-official solution of difficulties by competent and authoritative rubricians. The new edition of *Memoriale Rituum*, which is in preparation, will throw light on points in the simpler rite, and further guidance for the pontifical rite is needed.

J. B. O'C.

The Flying Bishop. Fifty Years in the Canadian Far North. By Mgr Gabriel Breynat, O.M.I. Pp. xii + 288. (Burns Oates. 21s.)

THERE can be few foreign missions more arduous than that through which runs the Arctic Circle, the Athabasca-Mackenzie Vicariate in which the late Archbishop Breynat spent fifty years as an active missionary. During his ministrations to the Eskimoes and Indians of Northern Canada he covered thousands of miles in canoe and dog-sleigh in his earlier years but from 1929 until his retirement in

1943 he travelled by air. Occasionally he used public airlines, but having acquired his own aircraft he used this exclusively for his missionary journeys, thus becoming known—over a much wider area than Canada—as “The Flying Bishop”.

Mgr Breynat's active life among the pagans of the North was in true accord with the Rule of his religious brethren, the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, who were founded to evangelize the people of remote regions. He valued his community traditions, but was equally devoted to his lonely apostolate of carrying the Faith to those whose lives were completely non-religious. His heart beat warmly for such people, and particularly for the Eskimoes; not that they readily responded to the call of Christianity (they are extremely difficult of conversion) but because of their pitiable ignorance of all things spiritual. With few exceptions they are a gentle and approachable race. In contrast with Eskimoes in general were the two men who brutally murdered Fathers Rouvière and Le Roux, and whose trial did little credit to the Court in which it was conducted. That story is one of the most exciting chapters in this interesting book.

Although the author lived into his eighties (he died whilst his book was in the press) his life had been one of extreme hardship, the kind of hardship that means frostbite, starvation and disease. In the face of much suffering and privation this great priest of God accomplished the almost unbelievable, and his work was recognized and appreciated during his lifetime. He was loaded with honours by both Church and State, and he has a secure place in the history of missionary achievement; but the most significant memorial to his name is the large number of missions and parishes he established in the Canadian Far North, where the Faith now flourishes with a youthful and heartening vigour.

The Mary Potter Story. By Rev. Francis Ripley. Pp. 54. (Burns & Sons, 195 Buccleuch Street, Glasgow. 1s. 6d.)

Few great Catholic Englishwomen can be less well known to their countrymen than is Mary Potter; and one of the reasons for this is doubtless the absence—until now—of a concise yet complete account of her life. Father Ripley tells her story in a most vivacious and realistic fashion, obliging his readers to acknowledge that although England has produced many heroic women who have been the glory of the Church, there was never one quite like Mary Potter. She is from almost every aspect unique.

Her good convert mother carefully watched over Mary's childhood in such a way that a true vocation to the religious state gradually dominated everything else in the young girl's life. When

twenty years of age she entered a Convent of Mercy, but delicate health obliged her to leave after several months in the noviciate. Her sense of vocation to God's service increased day by day, accompanied by a growing conviction that she was to establish a new Order of Nursing Sisters, a conviction shared by few among those whose help she sought. When Cardinal Manning was consulted he said: "Let Miss Potter return to her mother"; but a Father Selley encouraged and befriended her. Difficulties served but to increase her virtue; she triumphed over them all, to become the first woman in England to found a distinctive and purely nursing Sisterhood. In 1879, three years before the first five members of the Little Company of Mary took their Vows, a medical examination revealed that the Foundress had cancer. This in no way deterred her from her life's work. She lived until the year 1913, by which time her hospitals had increased beyond all expectation. They continue to expand with undiminished vigour.

There is more than a touch of the miraculous about the life of this remarkable woman. The "Blue Sisters" she gave to the Church devotedly cherish her spirit of selfless charity to the sick, attracting many noble-minded girls to follow in the footsteps of the holy Foundress by dedicating their lives to the apostolate of hospital wards. We confidently await the introduction of Mary Potter's "Cause", and the final approval of the Holy See respecting her personal sanctity, her work for the sick and her edifying writings.

A Spoiled Priest and other stories. By Canon P. A. Sheehan. Pp. 122. (Clonmore & Reynolds, Dublin; Burns Oates, London. 8s. 6d.)

The Mouse Hunter. By Lucile Hasley. Pp. x + 242. (Sheed & Ward. 12s. 6d.)

THERE are grades and degrees in all branches of literature, story-telling included. Here are works from two widely differing authors, so unlike each other as seemingly to defy comparison; but they share the gift of compelling one's attention, each being an artist in telling a story.

To Canon Sheehan's generation of readers his novels and short stories were unsurpassed; they were read aloud to eagerly listening families as were the works of no other Catholic author of the Canon's day. But his day is not past; it is the popularity of his writings that has called for their continued publication. The present volume (one among many) contains several short stories. To re-read them, after many years, is to realize that they cannot be "dated", and that they will always retain their freshness and vivid interest for Catholics who love the lighter classics of religious literature.

Mrs Hasley, a modern American lady, has acquired a wide reputation as a humorous prose-writer. She is never satisfied merely to be amusing, but always manages to bring before her readers the doctrines of the Church, particularly as they affect family life, she herself being a busy wife and mother. For such a person, nervously making her Confession, to be pulled up with: "Now, Baby, come clean; what are you hiding, to stammer so?"—well, it might be historical and it might be imaginary, but it is evidently true to American life. Although Mrs Hasley is a champion of the clergy, she understands their weaknesses sufficiently to comment upon them unhurtfully, as is proved by the fact that she retains the clergy among her most admiring readers.

L. T. H.

Historia Pontificalis. John of Salisbury's Memoirs of the Papal Court. Translated from the Latin with Introduction and Notes by Marjorie Chibnall, D.Phil. (Nelson. 20s.)

THIS is the first time that the *Historia Pontificalis* has been translated into English and it has been admirably done as anyone can see who compares this fluent, accurate and graceful version with the original on the opposite pages. This volume which was expected after Volume I of the Letters (Nelson) and the recent translation of the *Metalogicon* (Cambridge University Press) is fully up to the high standard of that excellent series, Nelson's Medieval Texts, and it will be welcomed by students of the period. *Historia Pontificalis* is a modern title; the book is, in substance, John of Salisbury's memoirs of the curia of Eugenius III for the years 1148–52. Actually, a volume in the catalogue of books at Christ Church, Canterbury, in the time of Prior Henry of Eastry, was described as *Libellus J. Sarum de statu curie Romane*, and there is general agreement that this is the same book.

Mrs Chibnall's excellent Introduction includes a careful discussion of the chronological difficulties that troubled that able editor, A. Lane Poole; there are very useful notes, clear, learned and apposite, and in translating John of Salisbury's frequent quotations from Scripture the Douai version of the Bible has been used because of its closeness to the Vulgate. There are, moreover, five appendices and a thoroughly good index. The whole thing has been very well done and it was very well worth doing.

John of Salisbury, whom Stubbs rightly called the central figure of English learning in the twelfth century, was a great Christian humanist, soaked in the Latin classics—so far as they could then be known—who yet never compromised in any degree his faith and

morality. And unlike most medieval scholars and all his eminent contemporaries (except Archbishop Theobald), he was moderate, reasonable and fair-minded, free from heat and partisanship, scrupulous to achieve accuracy. Under his quiet and restrained manner lurked wit and humour—witness his last conversation with Becket, or that shrewd remark about the inborn, inveterate, ineradicable avarice of the Romans. When he is relating the highly metaphysical discussion at the Council of Reims about the trinitarian doctrine of Gilbert de la Porrée, he is careful to speak always with great respect of St Bernard; but he remembers that “ille sanctissimus abbas” was likewise the assailant of Abailard purely out of zeal for orthodoxy and he does not conceal his suspicion that the group of St Bernard’s supporters, Suger, Peter Lombard and Robert of Melun, may possibly have been actuated by mixed motives. Very interesting, too, is what he tells us of Eugenius, who is commonly represented as being at all times under the direction of St Bernard. John, however, gives a number of instances where the Pope showed himself ready to act upon his own decisions; Eugenius could refute with a humorous apologue some hypocritical excuses of that turbulent prelate, Henry of Blois, and with great warmth of feeling he could labour to patch up Hugh of Molise’s broken marriage. Curiously enough, the first half of the twelfth century appears to be rather full of matrimonial discords that were terminated by annulment. There was among others the famous case of Louis VII and Eleanor of Aquitaine, and likewise that of her sister. In fact, it would appear that up to about the middle of the twelfth century the Church’s law of matrimony, or any rate the application of it, was in a state of uncertainty.

Despite sporadic outbreaks of heresy, doctrinal questions were not the most troublesome ones at mediaeval Councils. At Reims Eugenius III found himself confronted with the conflicting claims of headstrong metropolitans. The archbishop of Lyons claimed jurisdiction over Rouen, Sens and Tours; the archbishop of Vienne claimed jurisdiction over Bourges; the archbishop of Bourges claimed jurisdiction over Narbonne and Le Puy; Theobald of Canterbury was at variance with Henry Murdach of York, and finally, Trèves claimed right of primacy over Reims, a pretension that rendered the Frenchmen speechless. And when Eugenius got away from Reims to hold a supplementary Council at Cremona for the Italians, he met with the very same thing as between Milan and Ravenna.

The *Historia Pontificalis* does not supply a great deal of information about the ecclesiastical affairs of England; in that respect it is evidence of the truth of Tout’s dictum that in the twelfth and

thirteenth centuries the history of England and of France is one and the same story. The main topic is the quarrel between Theobald and the monks of St Augustine's, Canterbury.

J. J. D.

Ordination to the Priesthood. By John Bligh, S.J. Pp. xv + 189. (Sheed & Ward. 16s.)

THE rite of ordination to the priesthood is a complicated but very instructive ceremony. The Constitution *Sacramentum Ordinis* of 1947 cleared up all doubts concerning what is now the essential matter and form; it in no way simplified the rite. This then still remains in all its rich and intricate splendour. It is surely to be expected that ordinands bring to their ordination a knowledge and understanding of the great and significant ritual which will enrol them in the ranks of the priesthood. Yet this will not be achieved easily and it requires some effort of preparation. Our ordination rites are a growth of centuries; a proper appreciation of them is not to be had without some knowledge at least of their history and formation. What has made such a preparation a difficult task for the student is the absence of a suitable book, containing in an accessible form the information he needs. Father Bligh has now written for him just the book he wanted.

The work is a liturgical and theological commentary on the ordination rite, which explains the meaning of it and all its parts, as this is revealed to us in light of its history. There are two parts. The first is introductory; it discusses the purpose of the rite, the main stages of its development, the past opinions on the essentials of the rite, and the connexion of ordinations with Embertide. The second and principal part gives a description and explanation of the modern rite. Five illustrations from the older Pontificals are included, together with a bibliography and an index.

The author writes clearly and marshals his information well. The erudition is present but not obtrusive, and the book is attractively readable. The historical side of it is unexceptional, but many will find the theological comments disappointing. Certainly, no one would expect here a full theological elucidation of the priesthood, and besides, it is perhaps unfair to cavil at what is largely a question of theological opinion. Nevertheless the level of reflexion does seem superficial, and that makes the view that the priestly power is only a moral power appear more than ever as an inadequate basis on which to erect the structure of the Christian priesthood. These observations, however, apply almost exclusively to the opening chapter, and they do not detract from the essential excellence of this litur-

gical study. The work is invaluable to all interested in the liturgy of ordinations, and it is, above all, admirable reading for deacons making their immediate preparation for the priesthood.

All Things in Christ: Encyclicals and Selected Documents of Saint Pius X.
Edited by Vincent A. Yzermans. Pp. xviii + 275. (The Newman Press. \$4.00.)

THIS collection has been made as a documentary testimony to the life and work of St Pius X; it forms a useful supplement to the biographies of that great Pope. Thumbing through the pages, the reader will be at once impressed by the evident vitality and inspiration that marked his reign. Apart from their historical and biographical interest, many of these documents remain important by their subject-matter, and some of them are not readily available in translation. Libraries then would do well to add this volume to their shelf of papal documents. The translation is competent enough, but undistinguished as a whole; the introductions tend to be gushy and naive.

The Church Teaches: Documents of the Church in English Translation. By John F. Clarkson and others. Pp. xiv + 400. (B. Herder. 43s.)

THERE can be no serious theology that does not include a careful study of the documents of the Church. At once the need for adequate translations comes to mind. Nowadays interest in theology is by no means confined to clerical circles, and the present widespread desire for theological knowledge should be fostered and helped in every way. The days are long past—will they ever return?—when one could presume an acquaintance with Latin on the part of the educated, and the use of translations has become an inescapable necessity. "Even seminarians," writes Father van Ackeren in his preface to the above volume, "who have had several years of training in Latin still find the stately language of the Church difficult, and eagerly search for translations in their native tongue." All praise then to the Americans for their tireless zeal in translating.

The present book has been prepared by a group of Jesuit Fathers from St Mary's College, Kansas. An English Denzinger would best describe it. It is clearly intended as a companion to the Latin *Enchiridion*, but there are considerable differences in content and arrangement between the two. To compare them will be helpful.

The latest edition of Denzinger has 3033 numbered paragraphs, plus a few added texts in an appendix; *The Church Teaches* has 895. The American selection is, however, a judicious one, and the student

will find there most of the documents he needs. The sections chosen are for the most part sections given in Denzinger, and the translation has, with few exceptions, been based on the text as found there. However, 122 paragraphs contain texts not given in the Latin collection. This is due first of all to a fuller selection from recent encyclicals. Then there is the valuable Letter of the Holy Office to Archbishop Cushing of Boston, which was occasioned by the recent aberrations in that region about salvation outside the Church. Finally, sixty-eight of these additional sections are taken up with the texts of the dogmatic constitutions that were prepared for the consideration of the Vatican Council but never ratified, because of the premature dispersal of the Council. Interesting as these documents are, many will rightly question the wisdom of their inclusion. It is true that care is taken to state their exact significance; their presence, none the less, will inevitably clothe them for the student mind with an authority that they do not possess. If it is urged that they only contain what all would admit is Catholic doctrine, the reply is that the history of conciliar decrees and of the discussions that preceded and prepared them, including those of the Vatican Council itself, shows that questions of phraseology and vocabulary are by no means unimportant. The space given to these unauthoritative texts is disproportionate; a few selections in footnotes would have been more suitable.

Instead of the chronological order of Denzinger, the editors have preferred to arrange the texts under subject headings—a decision which reminds one of Cavallera's *Thesaurus doctrinae catholicae*. A table of references to Denzinger and the placing of the corresponding Denzinger number under each paragraph number make it possible to turn from one book to the other in a matter of seconds. Brief introductory notes, historical and doctrinal, are scattered throughout the volume; these are restrained, unobtrusive, and to the point. There is also a topical and a general index.

What of the quality of the translation? Some samplings show that it is of a high level. The rendering is clear and reads well, yet it remains accurate and close to the original. Some blemishes have been noticed. "The very desire of faith" is not the true meaning of "ipsum credulitatis affectum" in the Second Council of Orange (n. 545). In the Letter of Innocent I to Decentius, the remark concerning the holy chrism *non solum sacerdotibus sed et omnibus uti Christianis licet in sua aut in suorum necessitate unguendum* is translated in this way: "It is not just priests but all as Christians who may be anointed with this oil when it is necessary for themselves or their families." This is to impose a saving but less probable interpretation on a

much discussed text. Monsignor Knox's translation of *Humani Generis* has been used by the editors. They take it from the *Tablet* and fail to notice one important improvement made later in this translation. The first rendering "without equipping them for the beatific vision" (given in n. 395) should now read "without ordaining them for the beatific vision", as in the C.T.S. edition, n. 26; this is far truer to the original. A further detailed examination might bring other flaws to light, but the prospective reader can rest assured that the translation in general is a fine achievement, well above the average usually encountered.

It is a pity that the price will prevent the wide sale in this country of this most useful work; it can be thoroughly recommended.

Surprised by Joy: The Shape of My Early Life. By C. S. Lewis. Pp. 224. (Geoffrey Bles. 15s.)

THE men of our age seem never tired of reading about each other's spiritual journeyings. This is not said in condemnation of the interest. The subjective awareness of modern man has opened new chapters for theological reflexion on the psychology of belief and unbelief. Conversion accounts well told can also be a great aid to others who are still groping their way. The many who appreciate the fine qualities of Mr Lewis's spiritual writings will look in this book for a sensitive study of his passage from Atheism to Christianity. They will not be disappointed. Its special characteristics will not be liked by all, but those who can appreciate its flavour—and fortunate they are—will be grateful to the author for this engaging record of his spiritual history.

By "joy" the writer means that unsatisfied desire in us which is itself more desirable than any other satisfaction. He traces its influence in his life, until at last it brought him to the One Who is the desired. The first chapters are more generally autobiographical; they have all the interest of such writing. The almost unbelievable schooldays will inevitably draw the attention, but many, too, will reflect much on the defects and mistakes of his early religious formation. How many children must grow up without any true idea of God! As the book progresses the attention is more narrowly confined to his spiritual development. The last chapter but one, telling of the conversion to theism, is truly magnificent and moving; it culminates in this last paragraph:

You must picture me alone in that room in Magdalen, night after night, feeling, whenever my mind lifted even for a second from my work, the steady, unrelenting approach of Him whom

I so earnestly desired not to meet. That which I greatly feared had at last come upon me. In the Trinity Term of 1929 I gave in, and admitted that God was God, and knelt and prayed; perhaps, that night, the most dejected and reluctant convert in all England. I did not then see what is now the most shining and obvious thing; the Divine humility which will accept a convert even on such terms. The Prodigal Son at least walked home on his own feet. But who can duly adore that Love which will open the high gates to a prodigal who is brought in kicking, struggling, resentful, and darting his eyes in every direction for a chance of escape? The words *compelle intrare*, compel them to come in, have been so abused by wicked men that we shudder at them; but, properly understood, they plumb the depth of the Divine mercy. The hardness of God is kinder than the softness of men, and His compulsion is our liberation (p. 215).

The transition from mere theism to Christianity is then briefly described.

Scattered throughout the book are incidental observations of great discernment. Here is the best of these:

Selfish, not self centred. . . . The distinction is not unimportant. One of the happiest men and most pleasing companions I have ever known was intensely selfish. On the other hand I have known people capable of real sacrifice whose lives were nevertheless a misery to themselves and to others, because self-concern and self-pity filled all their thoughts. Either condition will destroy the soul in the end. But till the end, give me the man who takes the best of everything (even at my expense) and then talks of other things, rather than the man who serves me and talks of himself, and whose very kindnesses are a continual reproach, a continual demand for pity, gratitude, and admiration (p. 137).

Different as this account is from the Catholic conversion stories, it is none the less valuable. All who are trying to understand the contemporary spiritual scene should read it.

C. D.

Catholic Documents. Containing Recent Pronouncements and Decisions of His Holiness Pope Pius XII. No. XX. Pp. 46. (The Salesian Press, London. 2s. 6d.)

It is a pleasure to call attention to this valuable repertory of current papal pronouncements which is published on behalf of the Pontifical Court Club and has now reached its twentieth issue. Here, in an

English version, will be found the text of five addresses, delivered by the Holy Father in 1955, on such varied topics as the cinema, historical sciences, international conciliation, and the true foundations of human security in this age of technological progress and nuclear fission. It is to be hoped that this modestly priced and handsomely produced publication will find more and more subscribers.

Holy Week Manual. Pp. 188. (Burns Oates, London. Desclée & Co., Tournai. 5s. unbound.)

THE last-minute rush occasioned by the belated publication of the new Order of Holy Week prevented many priests from obtaining an adequate supply of manuals for their congregations. They will doubtless want to sample this manual in preparation for next year's demand. It contains, in parallel Latin and English, the Ordinary of the Mass, the Proper for the whole week and, in an appendix, the three psalms (xxii, lxxi, ciii) to be sung with the Communion antiphon during the distribution of Holy Communion at the Mass of the Lord's Supper. An explanatory introduction of the liturgy of each day is provided by Father J. B. O'Connell, who is also responsible, along with H. P. R. Finberg, for an excellent translation of the prayers. The Scripture translations are from the Knox version.

L. L. McR.

Church Building and Furnishing—The Church's Way. By J. B. O'Connell. (Burns Oates. 21s.)

FATHER O'CONNELL has written a very complete book which will serve the intelligent layman as well as the priest and the craftsman. He describes it as a "study in liturgical law in regard to the building, decorating and furnishing of a Catholic church". Everything the enquirer wants to know on this matter is here plainly set forth. With this book in hand one could, without much anxiety, erect a church which would in no way offend against the Church's law. In regard to all church requirements, their history, use and purpose, Father O'Connell is full of knowledge; he also gives many practical hints, the fruit of his experience, which make for the smooth running of ceremonies, the convenience of clergy and layfolk, and the general rightness of things. The distinction between sacred and other art is not easy to explain; Father O'Connell is admirably clear. It should be emphasized that sacred art is not exempt from the laws of design and other intellectual foundations of art; this seems sometimes to be forgotten. Meretricious, sentimental rubbish is often put into churches with the idea that it will be a greater aid to devotion than work

higher in conception and execution. While it is true that the careful following of the law will produce a better church, it does not follow that it will be beautiful; the supply of beauty-making persons depends largely on a social awareness of beauty, in which this country is sadly lacking. Hence we find sometimes what looks like a mass-production factory described as a "simple modern R.C. church". Simplicity is not necessarily a virtue. A sphere is the most simple shape; it is also the most boring thing to look at.

What chiefly emerges from this book is the importance of law. In Father O'Connell's treatment law becomes a friendly directing force and its vetoes beneficent sign-posts. Everyone should read this book; it is never dull, its language is clear and forceful, it is well arranged and contains a mass of very interesting information.

F. L.

The Churches of Europe under Communist Governments. Written by a member of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations, at the Council's request. Pp. 33. (Church Information Board, Church House, Westminster, S.W.1. 1954. 2s.)

THIS pamphlet is a brief, factual and dispassionate account of the persecution of the Christian churches under Communist control. It is not meant to be exhaustive. Poland, for instance, is omitted, though the author pays tribute to the stand being made there by the Catholic Church. Three typical situations are reviewed—those in which Orthodox and uniate Churches, Roman Catholics (as distinct from their Greek brethren), and finally Protestants are being persecuted. After a section on Russia, the author considers mainly Rumania, Czechoslovakia and East Germany as typical examples of the conditions mentioned. The booklet should do a service to the Christian cause.

R. F.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

eful
low
sons
this
like
R.C.
most

law.
ting
this
well

by a
Rela-
ation

f the
ol. It
itted,
y the
se in
stinct
y per-
mainly
mples
to the

F.

ished for
W.I., in

Th
41